

5609, granting a pension to B. F. Grigsby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORRELL: Resolution of the Grain Dealers' National Convention, relative to legislation to render the decisions of the Interstate Commerce Commission effective—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition relative to the eight-hour bill and the anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: Papers to accompany bill granting a pension to Annis Robinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Nugent—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McMORRAN: Petition of citizens of Marine City, Mich., against passage of a parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. PORTER: Petition of the Outdoor Art League, of California, urging that legislation be enacted to preserve the Calaveras trees of California—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, paper to accompany bill H. R. 7217, granting a pension to Elizabeth E. Schultz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the Grain Dealers' National Association, relative to legislation to render the decisions of the Interstate Commerce Commission effective—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee: Papers to accompany bill granting a pension to Nora Stokes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: Papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Cyrenius Dennis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIDER: Paper to accompany bill to remove charge of desertion from record of Joseph Mahon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Ira Bacon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBB: Petition of Jennie Pettit Morrison for increase of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUPPERT: Resolution of the Grain Dealers' National Convention, at Minneapolis, Minn., favoring enlargement of power of Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RYAN: Paper to accompany bill H. R. 6994, granting increase of pension to Theresa Nebrich—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill H. R. 6699, to pension Oscar W. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill H. R. 6995, granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Steel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill H. R. 6698, granting a pension to Mary L. Adler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT: Resolution of Woodson Post, No. 185, Grand Army of the Republic, Yates Center, Kans., favoring the passage of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolutions of the executive committee of the Southwestern Lumberman's Association, protesting against the passage of Senate bill 1261—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Petition of residents of New York Mills, N. Y., praying for legislation against polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SLEMP: Paper to accompany bill to correct military record of Henry H. Wynn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STERLING: Petition of merchants of Colfax, Ill., against the parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SULLIVAN: Paper to accompany bill granting increase of pension to Ira Bacon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAWNEY: Resolution of Booth Post, No. 130, Grand Army of the Republic, Grand Meadow, Minn., favoring passage of bill granting a pension of \$12 a month to soldiers who served ninety days or more in the war of 1861-1865—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: Resolution of citizens of North Carolina, asking for legislation against the cotton-boll weevil—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WACHTER: Resolution of Board of Trade of Baltimore city, relating to the deepening of the main ship channel from the port of Baltimore to a depth of 35 feet—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WADE: Petition of East Davenport Turnverein, of Davenport, Iowa, against the passage of the Hepburn bill, relative to interstate liquor traffic—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. WARNER: Petitions of citizens of Bement, Piatt

County; of citizens of Strasburg, Shelby County; of citizens of Cowden, Shelby County, and of Philo, Champaign County, Ill., protesting against the passage of any parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WILEY of New Jersey: Papers to accompany bill granting pension to Mrs. Hedwig A. Maas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: Paper to accompany bill to increase pension of Lucinda McCorkle; also, papers to accompany bill to increase pension of John M. Stevens; also, papers to accompany bill to pension John Whitehead; also, papers to accompany bill to increase pension of Cornelius C. Mangis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, December 15, 1903.

Prayer by Rev. J. WESLEY SULLIVAN, chaplain of the State senate, Harrisburg, Pa.

Mr. ANSELM J. McLAURIN, a Senator from the State of Mississippi, appeared in his seat to-day.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. BURROWS, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved. It is approved.

KIOWA INDIAN AGENCY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the results of the investigation into the affairs of the Kiowa Indian Agency; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of Plains Lodge, No. 135, Free and Accepted Masons, of East Baton Rouge Parish, La., v. The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. BURROWS presented petitions of sundry citizens of West Bay City and Lyons, and of the Ladies' Literary Club of Grand Rapids, all in the State of Michigan, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. PLATT of New York presented petitions of B. Frank Maxson Post, No. 428, of Alfred; of L. O. Morris Post, No. 121, of Albany; of William E. Avery Post, No. 438, of New York City; of A. A. Curtin Post, No. 392, of Geneseo; of Abraham Vosburg Post, No. 95, of Peekskill; of Gordon Granger Post, No. 7, of Clifton Springs; of Swift Post, No. 94, of Geneva; of C. L. Willard Post, No. 34, of Troy, and of D. F. Schenck Post, No. 271, of Fulton, all of the Department of New York, Grand Army of the Republic, in the State of New York, praying for the enactment of a service-pension law; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented petitions of the Woman's Home and Foreign Missionary Society of the Presbyterian Church of Mechanicsville; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Dobbs Ferry; of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Pinebush; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Halsey Valley; of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Westtown; of sundry citizens of Frankfort and Schuylers; of the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of Rensselaer; of the congregation of the United Presbyterian Church of Coila; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Angelica; of the Sabbath School of the Presbyterian Church of Catskill; of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Lake George; of the National Sabbath Alliance, of New York City; of sundry citizens of Corinth; of the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of Brunswick; of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Brookhaven, and of sundry citizens of New York Mills and Troy, all in the State of New York, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. FAIRBANKS presented memorials of the New Albany Ice Company, of New Albany; of the Retail Merchants' Association of Evansville, and of E. E. Perry, of Indianapolis, all in the State of Indiana, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation relative to the use of the mails for certain classes of literature and for contracts of insurance; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Rochester, Ind., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. KEAN presented petitions of the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of Cranford, of sundry citizens of Oak Ridge, of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Lamington, of the congregation of the Second Presbyterian Church of Belvedere, of sundry citizens of Westfield, and of the Mothers' Section of the Haddon Fortnightly of Haddonfield, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. MILLARD presented petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Adams, of sundry citizens of Waterloo, of the Ladies' Missionary Society of the First Presbyterian Church of Laurel, of the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of Laurel, of the Christian Endeavor Society of the Presbyterian Church of Winnebago, of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Clarks, of the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of Ponca, of the Woman's Missionary Society of Winnebago, and of the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Plattsmouth, all in the State of Nebraska, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. MILLARD (for Mr. DIETRICH) presented petitions of the congregation of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Wayne, of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Wayne, of sundry citizens of Wayne, of the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Plattsmouth, of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Tecumseh, of sundry citizens of Nelson, and of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Tecumseh, all in the State of Nebraska, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. BALL presented a petition of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of St. Georges, Del., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. HANNA presented petitions of the Young People's Union of the Mahoning Presbytery, of Canton; of the Hyperion Club, of Athens; of the congregation of the United Presbyterian, Presbyterian, and Methodist Episcopal churches of Richmond; of the congregation of the United Presbyterian Church of Reynoldsburg, Wellsville, Wooster, Youngstown, and Wheat; of the Woman's Christian Temperance unions of Oberlin, Delta, New London, Mount Pleasant, Columbus, Dover, and Sharon Center; of the Twentieth Century Club, of Wellston; of sundry citizens of Salineville and Galion, all in the State of Ohio, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 34, United Brotherhood of Leather Workers, of Columbus, Ohio, praying for the passage of the so-called eight-hour bill and also the anti-injunction bill; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented petitions of the Columbus Iron and Steel Company, of Columbus; of the Silver Manufacturing Company, of Salem; and of the Acme Machinery Company, of Cleveland, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to reorganize the consular service; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Plymouth, Ohio, praying for the enactment of a service-pension law; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented memorials of the Jackson Ice and Fuel Company, of Jackson; of the Stone Lake Ice Company, of Cincinnati; of the Hamilton Ice and Cold Storage Company, of Hamilton; of the John Shillito Company, of Cincinnati; of A. & H. Knorr, of Cincinnati; of the Arctic Ice Company, of Cincinnati; of Jacob Boneysteele, of Bellaire; of L. Beecher, of Hillsboro; of the City Ice Delivery Company, of Cleveland; of the Banner Ice Company, of Cincinnati, and of the J. B. McNab Ice Company, of Salem, all in the State of Ohio, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation relative to the use of the mails for certain classes of literature and for contracts of insurance; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented memorials of the Cigar Makers' International Local Union No. 123, of Hamilton; of Local Union No. 96, of Akron; of Local Union No. 48, of Toledo; of Local Union No. 75, of Columbus; of Local Union No. 45, of Springfield, and of Local

Union No. 79, of Sandusky, all in the State of Ohio, remonstrating against the ratification of the Cuban reciprocity treaty; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BEVERIDGE presented a memorial of sundry ministers of the Methodist Church of Indianapolis, Ind., remonstrating against the repeal of the anticanteen law; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Juneau, Alaska, remonstrating against a territorial form of government for Alaska; which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also presented a petition of Lew Dailey Post, No. 33, Department of Indiana, Grand Army of the Republic, of Bluffton, Ind., praying for the enactment of a service-pension law; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Butler, of the Local Council of Women of Indianapolis, of sundry citizens of South Bend, of the congregation of the Third Presbyterian Church of Fort Wayne, of the congregation of the Baptist Church of Fairmount, of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Bloomington, of the Woman's Home and Foreign Missionary Society of Sullivan, and of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Legonia, all in the State of Indiana, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. PENROSE presented petitions of the Christian Endeavor Society of Frankford; of sundry citizens of Coatesville, Warren, and Redcliff; of the Ladies' Aid Society of the First Baptist Church of Coatesville; of the Young People's Bible Union of the First Baptist Church of Coatesville; of the Salvation Army of Coatesville; of the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of Kittanning; of the congregation of the Forty-third Street Presbyterian Church, of Pittsburg; of sundry citizens of Parkers Landing; of the congregation of the United Episcopal Church of North Clarendon; of the Woman's Foreign and Home Missionary Society of West Pittsburg; of the Woman's Club of McKeesport; of the congregation of the Emanuel Methodist Episcopal Church, of Roxboro; of sundry citizens of Knoxville; of the congregation of the Belmont Avenue Baptist Church, of Philadelphia; of the congregation of the Memorial Baptist Church, of Philadelphia; of the Luther League of New Holland; of the congregation of the Twentieth Street Methodist Episcopal Church, of Philadelphia; of the congregation of the United Presbyterian Church of New Alexandria; of the congregation of the First Lutheran Church of Warren; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Warren; of the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of Warren; of the congregations of the United Brethren Methodist Episcopal churches and Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Sugar Grove; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Landisville; of the Woman's Missionary Society of the Homewood Avenue Presbyterian Church, of Pittsburg; of the congregation of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of the Atonement, of Kittanning; of the congregation of the First Baptist Church of Warren, and of the congregation of the North Broad Street Presbyterian Church, of Philadelphia, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. DRYDEN presented petitions of the congregation of the Wickliffe Street Presbyterian Church, of Newark; of the congregation of the Park Street Presbyterian Church, of Newark; of the congregation of the Clinton Avenue Reformed Church, of Newark; of the Mothers' Section of the Haddon Fortnightly, of Haddonfield; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Andover; of the Roseville Young Women's Christian Temperance Union, of Newark, and of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Danville, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented a memorial of the legislative committee of the National Cigar Leaf Tobacco Association, of New York City, remonstrating against the ratification of the Cuban reciprocity treaty; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BERRY presented petitions of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Epworth League, the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Christian Church, the Woman's Foreign Missionary Society, and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, all of Springdale, in the State of Arkansas, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. BATE presented petitions of the congregations of the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, and of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, all of

McMinnville, in the State of Tennessee, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. BURTON presented a petition of Colonel Givens Post, No. 200, Department of Kansas, Grand Army of the Republic, of Hallowell, Kans., praying for the enactment of a service-pension law; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of the National Business League, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for an increase of the United States Navy; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented the petition of H. A. Chambers and sundry other citizens of Warrington, Fla., praying for the enactment of legislation granting them the right of suffrage; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of the Current Literature Club, of Salina, of sundry citizens of Bartlett, and of the congregation of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Burlingame, all in the State of Kansas, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut presented a petition of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of the South Congregational Church, of New Britain, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors on all Government premises; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. FRYE presented a memorial of the Sinjaehriger Maenner Unterstutzungs Verein, of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented the petition of A. P. Randall and 17 other citizens of Brownell, Kans., and the petition of A. A. Hartley and 22 other citizens of Brownell, Kans., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. McCUMBER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 1559) granting an increase of pension to Marie A. Rask; and

A bill (S. 1652) granting an increase of pension to Minerva A. McMillan.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally with amendments, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 1704) granting an increase of pension to Lucretia Ritchart; and

A bill (S. 814) granting a pension to Mamie H. Thayer.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1985) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan Hites, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1984) granting an increase of pension to Levi Roberts, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. TALIAFERRO, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1604) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Bishop, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1206) granting a pension to Mary McLaughlin, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PENROSE, from the Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (S. 255) for the relief of the Farmers and Mechanics' National Bank, Philadelphia, Pa., reported it without amendment.

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES IN CUBA.

Mr. PLATT of New York, from the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the concurrent resolution submitted by Mr. PLATT of Connecticut on the 11th instant, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That there be printed 2,000 copies of the report of the War Department on the receipts and expenditures in Cuba during its occupation by the United States, 1,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, 750 copies for the use of the Senate, and 250 copies for the use of the War Department.

LUIS BOGRÁN H.

Mr. PROCTOR. I am directed by the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred a communication from the Secretary of State, transmitting a request of the Government of Honduras to authorize the Secretary of War to receive Don Luis Bográn H., of Honduras, as a student at the Military Academy at West Point, at the expense of the Government of Honduras, to report a joint resolution, and I ask for its present consideration.

The joint resolution (S. R. 24) authorizing the Secretary of War to receive for instruction at the Military Academy at West Point Luis Bográn H., of Honduras, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled. That the Secretary of War be, and he hereby is, authorized to permit Luis Bográn H., of Honduras, to receive instruction at the Military Academy at West Point: Provided, That no expense shall be caused to the United States thereby: And provided further, That in the case of the said Luis Bográn H. the provisions of sections 1320 and 1321 of the Revised Statutes shall be suspended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ASSISTANT IN DOCUMENT ROOM.

Mr. KEAN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution submitted yesterday by Mr. ALLISON, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to employ one additional assistant in the Senate document room, at a compensation of \$1,440 per annum, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided by law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Mr. BEVERIDGE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2561) granting an increase of pension to Mathias S. Friend (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2562) granting an increase of pension to Amos Hart (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2563) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth M. Banta (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2564) granting an increase of pension to John W. Branch;

A bill (S. 2565) granting an increase of pension to Webster Macy (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2566) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Kent (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2567) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Abbott (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2568) granting an increase of pension to Winfield S. Conde (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 2569) granting an increase of pension to John W. Allen.

Mr. FAIRBANKS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2570) granting a pension to Alfred Cunningham (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2571) granting an increase of pension to Alice McLeod (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2572) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Lucas (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2573) granting an increase of pension to Robert L. Bailey; and

A bill (S. 2574) granting an increase of pension to Nelson Purcell.

Mr. PLATT of New York introduced a bill (S. 2575) for the relief of the estate of William Wheeler Hubbell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2576) granting an increase of pension to James Redshaw; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. McCUMBER introduced a bill (S. 2577) granting an increase of pension to Albert Marshall; which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MILLARD introduced a bill (S. 2578) granting an increase of pension to Sylvester Beezley; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2579) for the relief of the estate of Brig. Gen. Wager Swayne, in charge of the Bureau of Refugees, Freedmen, and Abandoned Lands; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BURNHAM introduced a bill (S. 2580) granting an increase of pension to Susan F. Hill; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DILLINGHAM introduced a bill (S. 2581) granting an increase of pension to Myron D. Hill; which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2582) granting an increase of pension to Harry M. Sherman; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MARTIN introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 2583) to compensate A. Van De Vyver, bishop of the diocese of Richmond, Va., for the demolition, removal, and rebuilding of the Roman Catholic Church on the Government reservation at Old Point, Virginia (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2584) for the relief of Mrs. Sarah C. Jones and Mrs. Lucy F. Tyler;

A bill (S. 2585) for the relief of Wesley Rankins;

A bill (S. 2586) for the relief of Edgar M. Wilson, administrator of Thomas B. Van Buren, deceased;

A bill (S. 2587) for the relief of the legal representatives of Charles W. Adams, deceased;

A bill (S. 2588) for the relief of Gilbert Vandenberg;

A bill (S. 2589) for the relief of George T. Larkin;

A bill (S. 2590) to provide for the payment of overtime claims of letter carriers excluded from judgment as barred by limitation;

A bill (S. 2591) for the relief of the estate of Zachariah F. Calbreath, deceased;

A bill (S. 2592) for the relief of the estate of Robert N. Blake, deceased; and

A bill (S. 2593) for the relief of William Crosby.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 2594) for the relief of the State of Pennsylvania; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2595) granting an increase of pension to George F. Bailey; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. TALIAFERRO introduced a bill (S. 2596) granting a pension to Frances F. Hopkins; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2597) for the relief of the estate of Eliza Turner, deceased, Richard H. Turner, and Eliza Turner; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. McENERY introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 2598) for the relief of the estate of Henry E. Lawrence;

A bill (S. 2599) for the relief of the estate of Archibald D. Palmer, deceased;

A bill (S. 2600) for the relief of E. H. Flory;

A bill (S. 2601) for the relief of the estate of Rosemond Le Blanc, deceased;

A bill (S. 2602) for the relief of Florville Kerlegan; and

A bill (S. 2603) for the relief of the estate of Jacob A. Wolfson, deceased.

Mr. PETTUS introduced a bill (S. 2604) for the relief of Christopher McDonald; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. DRYDEN introduced a bill (S. 2605) to authorize the appointment of Acting Asst. Surg. Leopold Herbert Schwerin, United States Navy, as an assistant surgeon in the United States Navy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. McLAURIN introduced a bill (S. 2606) for the relief of G. D. Hearn; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2607) for the relief of E. M. A. Owen; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BERRY introduced a bill (S. 2608) for the relief of the heirs and legal representatives of George R. Johnson, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PATTERSON introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2609) granting a pension to Charlotte M. Kittredge;

A bill (S. 2610) granting a pension to Henry B. Wise;

A bill (S. 2611) granting a pension to Ellen J. Throckmorton;

A bill (S. 2612) granting a pension to Sarah H. Bellamy; and

A bill (S. 2613) granting an increase of pension to Robert J. Miller.

Mr. CARMACK introduced a bill (S. 2614) for the relief of H. J. Brewer; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2615) for the relief of the estate of Wiley B. Brigrance, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 2616) making appropriation to pay the estate of Samuel Lee, deceased, in full for any claim for pay and allowances made by reason of the election of said Lee to the Forty-seventh Congress and his services therein; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2617) to authorize Mr. H. H. D. Peirce, Third Assistant Secretary of State, to accept a decoration conferred upon him by the Government of the French Republic; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CULLOM introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2618) granting an increase of pension to Mary Foster (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2619) granting a pension to Augustus Nelson (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2620) granting an increase of pension to Ira Bacon (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 2621) for the widening of V street northwest; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2622) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John R. Thomas; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MORGAN introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 2623) for the relief of David W. Hollis (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2624) for the relief of the estate of Jonathan Paulk, deceased (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2625) for the relief of the estate of Elizabeth Blake-more, deceased; and

A bill (S. 2626) for the relief of the estate of Mary McCaa, deceased.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 2627) for the relief of Agnes W. Hills and Sarah J. Hills; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2628) granting an increase of pension to William H. Durham; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BURROWS introduced a bill (S. 2629) granting a pension to William M. Smith; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BURTON introduced a bill (S. 2630) for the relief of W. H. De Long; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. FOSTER of Louisiana introduced a bill (S. 2631) to protect the Mississippi Valley from destructive floods; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I introduce a bill to establish a court of patent appeals, and for other purposes. I believe these bills in former sessions have been referred to the Committee on Patents, and I will ask to have this bill referred to that committee. I desire to say that I have not read the bill sufficiently to be willing to commit myself to its provisions.

The bill (S. 2632) to establish a court of patent appeals, and for other purposes; was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Patents.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut introduced a bill (S. 2633) granting an increase of pension to John Allen; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FRYE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2634) granting a pension to Delphina P. Lovering (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2635) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Lap-ham (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 2636) granting an increase of pension to Alvin D. Lane (with accompanying papers).

Mr. HEYBURN introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 25) requesting the President to acquire, by annexation or otherwise, the island of Santo Domingo and the dependencies of Santo Domingo and Haiti; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AMENDMENT TO DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. MILLARD submitted an amendment proposing to increase the salary of the United States consul at Solingen, Germany, to \$3,000, intended to be proposed by him to the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

ESTATE OF JOHN J. SHIPMAN.

Mr. PLATT of New York. I move that the Committee on the District of Columbia be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 1719) for the relief of Priscilla J. Shipman, administratrix of the estate of John J. Shipman, deceased, for work done and materials furnished to the District of Columbia, and that it be referred to the Committee on Claims.

The motion was agreed to.

A. R. CRUZEN.

Mr. CARMACK submitted the following resolution, which was read:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be directed to inform the Senate whether any report has been made to the Treasury Department by L. Cullom, special agent of the Treasury, with respect to the conduct of A. R. Cruzen, collector of customs in Porto Rico; and, if so, to transmit the same to the Senate with a statement of what action, if any, has been taken thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. The passage of the resolution involves a matter of policy, and that is whether the reports of inspectors of the Treasury Department, the Interior Department, or any other Department should be called for to be made public while the proceedings have not been completed. I hesitate about passing resolutions calling for the reports of special agents or inspectors who have been asked to consider charges of malfeasance against public officers. I wish that the resolution may lie over. I should like to make some inquiries about it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will go over under the rule, and under the unanimous consent given on Saturday it will lie on the table until after the bill under consideration has been disposed of.

Mr. CARMACK. So I understood. I have not asked for the present consideration of the resolution. I ask that it may lie over until the present order is discharged.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will lie over.

Mr. CARMACK. I had not asked for its present consideration.

OLD GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE BUILDING.

Mr. HOAR submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds be directed to inquire as to the safety of the old Government Printing Office, so called, and whether any persons are or are likely to be employed therein by the Government under circumstances involving their personal safety.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to have referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, without having it read, a communication under the authority of the writer, to which his name is signed, in the Washington Post of yesterday morning on this subject. It is a paper accompanying the resolution and explaining it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the paper will accompany the resolution and be referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

RECORDS OF THE VIRGINIA COMPANY OF LONDON.

Mr. LODGE submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That under the direction of the Librarian of Congress there be printed and bound in cloth 7,000 copies of the records of the Virginia Company of London, now in the custody of the Library of Congress—500 copies for the Senate, 1,500 copies for the House of Representatives, and 5,000 copies for use and distribution by the Library of Congress.

PURCHASE FROM NEW PANAMA CANAL COMPANY.

Mr. MORGAN submitted the following resolution; which was read:

Resolved, That the Attorney-General is directed to inform the Senate whether he has made, or is making, on behalf of the United States, a purchase from the New Panama Canal Company of any property rights, privileges, or concessions that were granted by the Republic of Colombia to N. B. Wyse for the construction of a canal at Panama, or any interest in the Panama Railroad, or any part of the stock of the Panama Railroad Company chartered under the laws of New York; and if such purchase has been made, or is being attempted or negotiated, under what state or government is the sale of any or all such property authorized to be made by the New Panama Canal Company?

2. And that he will inform the Senate as to the terms of such proposed purchase, or consummated purchase, including the sum to be paid for such property and canal rights and privileges, and that he will send to the Senate copies of all papers relating thereto that are or have been in his possession or under his control, so as to inform the Senate fully as to the entire transaction.

3. That he will inform the Senate as to any participation of the Government of France in such purchase or sale, whether the same is proposed or consummated, and whether any and what agreement has been entered into between France and the authorities now exercising the powers of the government on the Isthmus of Panama in respect of said purchase and sale of the property and rights of the New Panama Canal Company.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. What does the Senator request?

Mr. MORGAN. I ask that under the rule, as I understand it, the resolution may lie on the table, subject to call.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will lie on the table, if there be no objection, subject to call.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 66) in relation to commuted rations for midshipmen; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PRINTING OF MAP.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is a bill (S. 2525) which was introduced yesterday by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SCOTT] and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia. It provides for an illustration, and under the law the order to print must be made. The Chair will take the liberty of making the order to print the illustration as well as the bill.

COMMUTED RATIONS FOR MIDSHIPMEN.

Mr. HALE. I ask that the joint resolution which has just come from the House of Representatives be laid before the Senate.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 66) in relation to commuted rations for midshipmen was read for the first time by its title.

Mr. HALE. I ask that the joint resolution be read at length, and then I will move an amendment.

The joint resolution was read the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate, etc., That the provision under the heading "Supplies and accounts," in the act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, and for other purposes, approved March 3, 1903, for "Provisions, Navy," shall not be so construed by the accounting officers of the Treasury as to deprive midshipmen on sea duty of the benefit of commuted rations as provided by section 1577 of the Revised Statutes.

Mr. HALE. This is simply a measure to correct a mistake in punctuation in a clause in the naval act. The House has corrected it. I ask the Senate to concur with the joint resolution from the House with an amendment striking out the words "on sea duty" in line 9. That will leave the law just as it is at present.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maine asks for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. HALE. In line 9 I move to strike out the words "on sea duty" after the word "midshipmen."

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time, and passed.

VANDEGRIFT CONSTRUCTION COMPANY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

Referring to section 32 of the act approved April 12, 1900, entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," I transmit herewith an ordinance enacted by the executive council of Porto Rico on March 2, 1903, granting to the Vandegrift Construction Company the right to build and operate a line of railway between the municipality of Ponce and the playa of Ponce in the island of Porto Rico, and to develop energy by water or other power for distribution and sale for railway, lighting, and industrial purposes.

This ordinance was approved by the President of the United States on March 21, 1903.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, December 15, 1903.

LOUISIANA PURCHASE EXPOSITION.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Select Committee on Industrial Expositions, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State, covering a statement showing the receipts and disbursements of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition Company for the month of October, 1903, furnished by the Louisiana Purchase Exposition Commission in pursuance of section 2 of the "Act to provide for celebrating the one hundredth anniversary of the purchase of the Louisiana Territory," etc., approved March 3, 1901.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

WHITE HOUSE, December 15, 1903.

GOVERNMENT LANDS CONTROLLED BY WAR DEPARTMENT.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a supplemental report by the Secretary of War, submitting additional data regarding land owned by the United States and under control of the War Department, in further compliance with an item contained in the sundry civil appropriation act approved June 28, 1902.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

WHITE HOUSE, December 15, 1903.

NOTE.—Papers accompanied similar message to the House of Representatives.

LIEUT. COL. L. K. SCOTT.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State, with accompanying papers, concerning the claim of Lieut. Col. L. K. Scott, a British subject, on account of the adoption by the Ordnance Department of the United States Army of a system of sighting of which he is the inventor.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

WHITE HOUSE, December 15, 1903.

NORWEGIAN STEAMER NICARAGUA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, as a case not acted upon by the Fifty-seventh Congress, a report from the Secretary of State, and accompanying papers, relating to the appeal for indemnity addressed to the equitable consideration of the Government of the United States by the owners of the Norwegian steamer *Nicaragua*.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, December 15, 1903.

TRADE RELATIONS WITH CUBA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The morning business is closed, and the Chair lays before the Senate House bill 1921.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1921) to carry into effect a convention between the United States and the Republic of Cuba, signed on the 11th day of December, in the year 1902.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement the time will be equally divided to-day between those who favor the bill and those who oppose it. It will be a convenience, therefore, for the Chair if a Senator rising to address the Senate would state whether he speaks for or against the bill.

Mr. CULLOM. I suppose that the question of dividing time will depend upon the hours or minutes Senators speak. Some Senators will make brief speeches and others long ones. So I think it might be well—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will try to recognize that, and divide the time as well as it can be divided.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President—

Mr. LODGE. I ask the Senator from California to yield to me for a moment.

Mr. PERKINS. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. I merely wish to put into the RECORD certain papers in connection with a discussion I had with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] yesterday in regard to the immigration laws of Cuba.

I ask leave to have printed in the RECORD the order from the Acting Secretary of War of April 14, 1899, which put in force in Cuba by general order all the laws of the United States.

I should also like to have printed in the RECORD the sections relating to Chinese labor which are taken from our laws, and which were formally enacted by the military government on the 15th of May, 1902, just before we withdrew from the island.

I also submit a letter from Colonel Edwards, the head of the Insular Bureau, transmitting these papers to me. He says, at the end of the letter:

I have just made inquiry of the State Department, and they tell me that, as far as they have any knowledge, this order of May 15, 1902, has not in any wise been modified since our occupation ceased.

I also made inquiry of the minister of Cuba, and he informs me that our laws in regard to the prohibition of Chinese labor are in force in Cuba to-day and have not been modified by his Government.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and the papers will be printed in the RECORD.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[Circular No. 13.]

WAR DEPARTMENT,
DIVISION OF CUSTOMS AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
Washington, April 14, 1899.

The following is published for the information and guidance of all concerned:

The laws and regulations governing immigration to the United States are hereby declared to be in effect in the territory under government by the military forces of the United States, and collectors of customs are directed to enforce said laws and regulations until the establishment of immigration stations in said territory. All money collected under this order must be deposited and accounted for as prescribed for customs collections.

G. D. MEIKLEJOHN,
Acting Secretary of War.

SEC. VII. None of the foregoing paragraphs shall apply to Chinese persons, the immigration of whom is prohibited; and during such prohibition it shall not be lawful for any Chinese laborer to come from any foreign port or place to Cuba.

The master of any vessel who shall knowingly bring to Cuba on such vessel, and land, or attempt to land, or permit to be landed, any Chinese laborer, meaning both skilled and unskilled, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and, on conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$500 for each and every such Chinese laborer so brought into Cuba, and may also be imprisoned for a term not exceeding one year.

Any Chinese person found unlawfully within Cuba shall be caused to be removed therefrom to the country whence he came, and at the cost of Cuba, after being brought before some judicial officer or tribunal in Cuba and found to be one not lawfully entitled to be or to remain in Cuba, and in all such cases the person who brought or aided in bringing such person to Cuba shall be liable to the Government of Cuba for all necessary expenses incurred in such investigation and removal, and Cuba shall pay all costs and charges for the maintenance and return of any Chinese persons having the certificate prescribed by law as entitling such Chinese person to come into Cuba who may not have been permitted to land from any vessel by reason of any of the foregoing provisions.

SEC. VIII. The prohibition of importation of Chinese shall apply to all subjects of China and Chinese, but shall not apply to diplomatic officers of the Chinese Government or other governments traveling upon the business of their government, whose credentials shall be taken as an equivalent to a certificate which will be required of merchants or other persons traveling for pleasure or business, and setting forth such facts as well as the character and estimated value of the business and a description of said merchant or person. The secretaries, the body and household servants of diplomatic officers of the Chinese Government or other government traveling upon the business of their government, and Chinese laborers and merchants who were in Cuba on April 14, 1899, and have since then continued to be residents thereof, who may now reside therein or abroad and are able to establish their identity, are also exempted from the provisions applying to other Chinese persons.

WAR DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF INSULAR AFFAIRS,
Washington, December 15, 1903.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In obedience to your telephone request I hasten to inclose herewith Order No. 155, Headquarters Department of Cuba, Habana, May 15, 1902, issued by General Wood, the approval of the Secretary of War having been previously given thereto, and call to your attention Sections VII and VIII thereof, prohibiting the immigration of Chinese.

I would furthermore call to your attention the inclosed circular, No. 13, Division of Customs and Insular Affairs, War Department, Washington, April 14, 1899, putting into effect the United States immigration laws in Cuba.

I have just made inquiry at the State Department and they tell me that as far as they have any knowledge this order of May 15, 1902, has not in any wise been modified since our occupation ceased.

Very sincerely,

CLARENCE R. EDWARDS,

Colonel, United States Army, Chief of Bureau.

Hon. H. C. LODGE,
United States Senate.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, the opponents of the Cuban reciprocity treaty seem to me to be on the wrong tack. They are like the captain who shapes the course of his vessel by dead reckoning north-northeast to reach a certain port, when the true course, which he might have ascertained had he taken the trouble, is northeast. He therefore must not be surprised if he brings up on the rocks.

It is asserted by those who oppose this treaty that it will injure certain great interests of the United States—sugar, citrus fruits, and tobacco. But I think that if they had taken "an observation," as the captain referred to should have done—in reality, have ascertained the facts—their argument would not have been in danger of shipwreck. It is true that Cuba competes with American sugar producers, beet and cane, but our sugar growers are protected against her by, I think, the highest tariff which we enforce, which amounts to 102 per cent ad valorem at the present prices for the same grade as beet sugar.

The Cuban treaty does not by any means put our producers at the mercy of Cuban planters, for the proposed reduction will leave a protection of 78 per cent on raw sugar and 82 per cent on refined, which should be quite sufficient for the encouragement of any enterprise. Our Secretary of Agriculture, in his latest annual report, states that the beet-sugar industry is well established and that its future depends on the adoption of economic methods in field and factory. If our farmers and beet-sugar manufacturers are not enterprising enough to adopt such methods and prosper under a protective duty of 82 per cent, it must be that they, too, have gone off on a north-northeast course, which, as in the case of the captain, would be their own fault.

NO REDUCTION IN PRICE OF SUGAR.

The fears expressed as to the dolorous fate of our domestic cane and beet sugar growers arises from the fact that it is feared that the market price of sugar may be reduced. If it is not reduced, domestic sugar will not, of course, feel any effect from the reduction in the duty.

If the opponents of this treaty think that sugar prices are about to fall, they have got still farther away from their true course. If they will read the accounts which come from our consuls in Europe, they will find that the results of the Brussels sugar conference mean shipwreck of their arguments.

These results are already appearing. The abolition of the export bounty has caused 42,620 acres to be withdrawn from sugar-beet culture in Germany, 44,347 acres in France, and 80,296 acres in Russia, and this in the present year, although the convention did not go into effect until September. And already the effect is becoming observable in exports from Germany, for it is pointed out by our consul in Leipzig that there was, for the first quarter of 1903, a decrease of exports of beet sugar to England amounting to 63,000 long tons.

In addition to the discouragement of export there is a governmental encouragement of domestic consumption of sugar in the sugar-producing countries of Europe, beginning with an increase in the allowance to the army and followed by the reduction of internal taxes, resulting in the lessening of price to domestic consumers. Under this policy it is estimated by eminent French authorities that the increase of the consumption of sugar in France will reach 600,000 tons per annum, and Germany hopes to increase her consumption 1,000,000 tons. This ought to greatly relieve the pressure of overproduction on the world's sugar market that has been depressing prices since the inauguration of the "cartel" in 1900, which the Brussels sugar convention abolished. Thus the tendency to export is weakened in two ways, and, according to a high Austrian authority, when Germany's consumption of sugar, which is now only 30 pounds per capita per year, equals that of England, which is 98 pounds, as says a German author, Max Shippel, in his book on sugar production, Germany will have no sugar whatever for export.

Another important fact is that nonsugar-producing countries which have been supplied by Germany, France, and Russia are now, because of the diminution in their beet-sugar supplies, increasing their purchases of cane sugar. It is noted that for the first time in twenty-five years England has bought sugar from Cuba.

PRICES IN THE WORLD MARKET WILL BE RAISED.

These facts mean this: That less beet sugar will be imported into the United States; that more of the cane sugar of the world will be consumed by foreign nations; that a larger and larger proportion of Cuban sugar will go to other markets than our own. The falling off in exports from beet-sugar countries will relieve the pressure upon the sugar market of the world, which will not only prevent a fall, but will probably increase domestic prices, which increase will surely come if our own consumption increases at its past ratio. Our own consumption per capita has increased pretty rapidly, from 54 pounds in 1884 to 66 $\frac{1}{2}$ pounds in 1894; and 72 $\frac{3}{4}$ pounds in 1902. That signifies an increase of 553,400 tons in eight years—over 6 pounds per capita.

We are the greatest sugar-consuming nation on earth except Great Britain, and if we were to deduct from her consumption the amount that goes into her jam and jelly industry, largely for export, it would probably show that our per capita consumption nearly equaled hers.

And it must be remembered that the reduction of 20 per cent is on Cuban sugar only, which forms but one-third part of our sugar imports. As against the other foreign sugars, American refined sugar will still have a protection of 102 per cent ad valorem at the present price of sugar in the American market.

Mr. CULLOM. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. PERKINS. Certainly.

Mr. CULLOM. I inquire of the Senator if he is sure he is correct in his statement as to the percentages? I have had some investigation made of the matter, and I thought the percentage was less than the Senator has stated.

AD VALOREM PROTECTION ON SUGAR.

Mr. PERKINS. I will state to the Senator from Illinois that I have examined into the matter, and that the figures I am giving have been obtained from the Treasury Department. They are as follows:

Average ad valorem duty on sugar.

	1901.	1902.	1903.
	<i>Per cent.</i>	<i>Per cent.</i>	<i>Per cent.</i>
Raw sugar	70.43	85.96	97
Refined sugar	70.83	82.23	101.06

This refined sugar is the same grade of sugar as the beet sugar which is granulated when it comes from the beet-sugar factory.

I think there is no question, Mr. President, but that these figures are correct, as they were given to me, as I have already stated, by the Treasury Department.

Mr. CULLOM. I only desired, if the Senator would allow me, to interrupt him sufficiently long to get the exact statement as the Treasury Department gives it, so that we may rely upon its being accurate.

WHY CUBAN SUGAR WILL NOT AFFECT PRICES.

Mr. PERKINS. The other foreign sugars are those which fix the price at which Cuban sugar will be sold here, for the cost to us has always depended on the cost of sugar at Hamburg, and will so depend whether Cuba sells us 1,000,000 or 2,000,000 tons or more a year.

Cuba can get in our market only what we are obliged to pay in the world market. No matter how much she may pour into the American market, Cuba can not change the price a shade. If she can produce cheaper than any other country on the globe, all her yearly product would not affect the American market, for we are compelled to buy two-thirds of our sugar from other foreign sources, and the price of Cuban sugar would conform to the price we paid her rivals. If she were able to supply our entire consumption, the price of Cuban sugar would still be governed by the world price. She could not go above it and would not go below it. And this world price, plus freight and a duty of 102 per cent ad valorem, is the price with which our domestic producers have to compete. Cuban sugar does not enter into the price problem at all.

WHAT THE REPUBLICAN PARTY HAS DONE.

What the Republican party has done for the domestic sugar-producing interests can be told briefly. In 1890 sugar was on the free list, and a bounty of 2 cents per pound was paid on beet and cane sugar produced in the United States. The Wilson-Gorman bill abolished the bounty and placed a duty of 40 per cent ad valorem on imported sugar. By the Dingley bill this duty was increased so that now it equals 98 per cent ad valorem on the price of raw sugar in the New York market. Then there is this consideration: Whenever there is any great strain or pressure at a given point, something is liable to give way. That there has been severe pressure, for a great many reasons, to grant some reductions of duty to Cuba we all know, and we probably avoid what might have happened—even greater reductions or possibly no duty—by granting 20 per cent; and besides this, the question of tariff is settled for five years.

THE CITRUS-FRUIT INDUSTRY.

There is another point where the opponents of the treaty think that we may be injured by Cuban competition if our tariff is reduced. This point is the citrus-fruit industry. The objections to the treaty on this score might be met with a chapter like the famous one dealing with snakes in Ireland. At least, if there are oranges and lemons in Cuba, there are so few as to cut no figure whatever in a question of competition with California and Florida citrus fruits. Cuba never has raised enough oranges and lemons to develop an export trade, in spite of all the advantages of proximity to a vast market, a favorable climate, cheap land, and low freights.

Less than three-tenths of 1 per cent of the soil under cultivation is devoted to citrus culture, and it is unlikely that under the most favorable conditions there would be an increase in production that would enable Cuba to become a rival of American growers. Citrus-fruit growing is what may be called a scientific occupation, requiring for good results great intelligence, great care, great botanical knowledge as far as relates to trees of this character, and great patience and industry. The ordinary native planters of Cuba possess none of these qualities, and in consequence turn to horticultural pursuits, in which nature does all the work required except that of the crudest kind, which is within the scope of native ability.

In consequence, although there is a vast market for citrus fruits in the United States, "the cultivation of oranges," as the Cuban census states, "has been generally abandoned since the development of oranges cultivated in Florida and California."

REDUCTION IN IMPORTS OF CITRUS FRUITS.

The value of the imports of Cuban oranges from 1898 to 1902, inclusive, were, by years, as follows: \$1,991, \$622, \$474, \$2,187, \$560. The value of lemons ranged from \$4 to \$545 per year. The duty on oranges is now 71 per cent ad valorem, and a reduction of 20 per cent would still leave a protection of 57 per cent ad valorem for the American grower, and it is hard to see how this slight reduction, leaving as it does the Cuban grower at a great disadvantage, can stimulate his intellectual faculties and imbue him with the energy that will be necessary if he is to raise citrus fruits for the American markets. It is impossible for him to compete with the American grower now, for he has no oranges to

sell, and it would be five or six years before groves planted this year could be brought into bearing, and this fact, if there were nothing else, would act as a deterrent to planting citrus-fruit trees.

Quick returns are what the Cuban desires. He is constitutionally averse to waiting a year or two for things to grow. In consequence sugar and tobacco will receive his attention in the future as in the past, and the Florida and California growers will be left in possession of our citrus-fruit market. The United States consul-general at Habana thinks that steps should be taken to ascertain the cause of the insignificance of the exports of fruit from Cuba. The cause is the less skill required in the cultivation of sugar and tobacco and the greater and more immediate the returns therefrom.

HIGH AD VALOREM DUTY ON CITRUS FRUITS.

It will be remembered that when the Dingley bill was under consideration the California delegation secured a material increase in the duty on citrus fruits, from 12 per cent under the Wilson-Gorman bill to 71 per cent ad valorem, the present rate of duty. This increase was urged not on account of danger from Cuban competition, but because of that of Jamaica, which has large and long-established orange orchards, on which greater and greater reliance would be placed as sugar growing diminishes, as has been the case for years, and as it will continue in the future. This bar against Jamaica oranges was effectual, and still remains at the very high notch at which we placed it.

While I know it is not fashionable to indulge in prophecy, yet I believe, Mr. President, so long as the Republican party has control of the administration of governmental affairs in this country that duty will not be reduced from its present rate either upon citrus fruit, sugar, or any great industry from which California has given such splendid results to the country.

There can be no question as to the adequacy of the protection of California citrus fruits against competition from an island that does not grow enough to export, and which will not increase its output to any appreciable extent until its hundreds of thousands of acres of sugar and tobacco land are brought under cultivation.

What protection has accomplished for the citrus-fruit interests of Florida and California is fully illustrated in the fact that in 1882 we imported \$5,500,000 worth of oranges, and in 1902 only \$784,000, worth, of which \$720,000 came from Italy, the British West Indies, and Mexico, against which the high tariff of 71 per cent ad valorem will still operate if the proposed reduction is made.

IN CASE CUBA IS ABLE TO INVADE OUR MARKETS.

The Senate's attention has been called to certain newspaper articles and private letters which state that a great number of orange trees have been or are about to be planted in Cuba, and that planting of such trees is going on all over the island. Assuming that this is true, I submit that the rejection of this treaty would neither prevent the planting of the new groves contemplated nor kill the trees already planted. If it be true that capital is being invested in citrus fruits in Cuba, we have no means of preventing it, and if Cuban oranges should by chance be able to drive California fruits from eastern markets in spite of a protective duty of 57 per cent ad valorem, after deducting the 20 per cent, I am very sure that whatever reduction in the cost of placing California fruits on the eastern market which would be necessary to hold that market would be made by the railroad companies, which otherwise would lose a very considerable part of their revenue.

The policy of railroads, like all other transportation companies that have a single right of way, is to charge all the traffic will bear, and that has kept the rates from California at a high figure—higher, in my opinion, than they should have been; but it would necessarily cause a reduction of rates on the part of the railroad companies, or they would lose the transportation of the products of these great industries from the Pacific to the Atlantic shore. The railroad companies, like others, are always alive and keen in protecting their own interests, and surely this small reduction of 20 per cent, if it be necessary, would not only be made up by the railroad companies, but even a greater reduction, in order that they may retain the business.

THE ENORMOUS DUTY ON TOBACCO.

In tobacco Cuba is a competitor of the United States, but our own producers are protected against this competition by a tariff which, reduced by 20 per cent, is still enormous. The average value of our tobacco crop of 1902 was 10 cents per pound, yet it is protected by a tariff of from \$1.85 to \$2.50 per pound on tobacco for wrappers, and from 35 to 50 cents per pound on tobacco for fillers. Our own production is principally tobacco of a quality suitable for fillers, yet it is protected by a tariff from three and a half to five times its average market value. If a reduction in

protection to 28 and 40 cents a pound on tobacco whose invoice value averages 45 cents is not sufficient to protect our own growers, I am unable to see how we can help them unless we give them, in addition to a protective tariff, a good big bounty. That the tobacco interests will not be injured by the proposed reduction is made clearly evident by the lack of protests against it from tobacco growers and manufacturers. I have received only two, I think, since the Senate voted on the treaty last March.

CALIFORNIA PRODUCTS WELL PROTECTED.

So far as my own State of California is concerned I think the measure of protection afforded to it by the Republican tariff is satisfactory. I have already shown that the importation of oranges has fallen from \$5,500,000 to \$784,000 per annum in twenty years, though California has not received the entire gain, Florida being also a producer. But in raisins, prunes, and currants she is the only producer, and in these staples the result is even more marked than in the case of citrus fruits. In 1892 we imported over 10,000,000 pounds of prunes; in 1902, only 500,000 pounds. In 1892 we imported nearly 21,000,000 pounds of raisins; in 1902 a little over 6,000,000 pounds. She has driven the foreign Zante currant from the market, and the French and German prune can now be found only in very isolated cases. And in spite of our growth in population and the increased consumption attending the extraordinary increase in wealth in the past ten years, our imports of still wines, which California makes, has remained absolutely stationary since 1892.

WHY THERE SHOULD BE RECIPROCITY.

I think it may be accepted as proven beyond a reasonable doubt that the proposed reduction in the Cuban tariff will injure no American industry. If it will not, and the reciprocal reduction of the Cuban tariff on American goods will benefit us, there can be no valid reason why the treaty shall not be made effective. In 1899 we sold Cuba products worth \$29,000,000 and bought from her \$37,000,000 worth. In 1901 we sold to her \$25,000,000 worth and bought \$49,000,000 worth. Thus, while we bought more from her, we sold less, which is not a satisfactory condition of affairs. Our percentage of sales to Cuba has fallen from 43 per cent to 41 per cent, while Germany has in the same period doubled her percentage of sales to Cuba, and England, France, and other European countries have materially increased their own. These facts show that we are being beaten by Germany, France, and England in the market which is at our very doors—in fact, are being crowded out of it.

Unless the tide can be stemmed we shall find our enemies, in an industrial sense, in possession of a market which should be virtually ours exclusively, and while we buy all, or nearly all, of Cuba's products, we shall sell them next to nothing. It seems to me that this is a state of affairs that should appeal to every business man, and should enlist him on the side of a treaty which will give us an advantage of from 20 to 40 per cent over our competitors, and will enable us to maintain and strengthen our commercial foothold in Cuba. It is unnecessary to call to mind the many staple products of our fields and factories that meet with sharp competition in the Cuban market. They will occur to everyone. But I will refer to the case of my own State, California, for an illustration.

WHERE CALIFORNIA WOULD BE BENEFITED.

Our olive oil, raisins, canned and preserved fruits, onions, beans and peas, canned salmon, preserved, canned, pickled, and salted vegetables, wines, and salt come into direct competition with the same class of goods imported into Cuba from France, Germany, Spain, and other countries. Our sales of these goods to Cuba amounted in 1902 to \$485,156, while the value of the imports from the other countries named amounted to over \$4,000,000. What share of the \$485,000 went to California I do not know, but I do know that with suitable encouragement by a reduction in the Cuban tariff my State will, if it makes the effort, receive much of that \$4,000,000 which now goes to Spain, Germany, and France.

California makes the best olive oil in the world, yet Cuba bought in our markets in 1902 only \$2,414 worth, while she bought from Spain \$887,125 worth and from France \$13,276 worth. She bought of us only \$1,036 worth of raisins, while Spain sold her \$39,563 worth. She bought from us \$77,000 worth of canned and preserved fruits, and from Spain and France \$170,000 worth. We sold her \$400,000 worth of onions, peas and beans, and other vegetables, excluding potatoes, while she bought of Spain, France, Germany, Mexico, and American countries other than the United States over \$1,000,000 worth. Of potatoes we sold her \$390,000 worth, while other countries sold her nearly as much. She bought of us wines worth \$3,529, and from Spain alone \$1,550,000 worth. Salt from the United States cost her \$575, while she paid \$70,000 to Spain and Germany alone.

CAN WE NOT CAPTURE THE CUBAN MARKET?

Here are a number of products which California prides itself it can supply in at least as good quality as can be found elsewhere in the world. Yet the people of Cuba buy ten times as much of them from other countries as from the United States. Can it be possible that a measure which will give us an advantage, on the average, of 30 per cent in Cuban markets over our competitors will not enable us to secure for ourselves a very large proportion of that trade which now goes to France, Spain, and Germany? It seems to me we should be put to the proof of our incapacity if we are in truth unable to take advantage of such an opportunity.

But observers abroad believe that the chances are in our favor. In the matter of wine, our consul at Lyons, France, after a careful study of the conditions of the French, Spanish, and American wine trades, writes to the State Department that he "can see no reason why the wine growers of New York, Ohio, and especially California, should not capture the Cuban market," and this without the proposed reduction of 20 and 30 per cent in the Cuban tariff.

THE DELEGATION'S LOYALTY TO CALIFORNIA'S INTERESTS.

I think the facts I have given relating to citrus fruits, sugar, wines, prunes, raisins, and other products of California demonstrate conclusively my loyalty to the State which has honored me by electing me again and again one of her representatives in this body.

In the framing of the Dingley bill the California delegation, as all know, struggled for protection for the industries of our State. The results of those struggles are seen in our immense orange groves, our vast vineyards, our forests of prune trees, our immense borax and quicksilver mines, and our hundreds of square miles of sugar-beet fields. Not one of that delegation would advise a step which would tend in the least to retard the growth of those great industries.

When it was proposed two years ago to authorize the negotiation of a treaty with Cuba, in terms which gave such latitude that there was a chance that the tariff bars might be let down too low for the safety of California producers, it is well known that I was one of that body of recalcitrants who successfully and, I think, wisely combated the measure. And in this opposition the delegation was backed by the California Republican State convention, which declared against that measure. When the treaty that we now propose to make effective was placed before us last winter, it was seen that no interest of California was endangered. Yet desiring to secure the views of my constituents, to whose kindness and consideration I feel that I owe all I am and all I ever hope to be, I sent copies of the treaty to the legislature, which was then in session, and which had just again re-elected me for the third time to the seat I now have the honor of occupying.

THE TREATY PLACED BEFORE THE LEGISLATURE.

The legislature had been elected a few months before, and was therefore fresh from the people. I sent the copies with an expression of my views as to the bearing of the treaty on our industries, but with the declaration that, should the legislature take an opposite view and instruct me to oppose a measure that I believed to be advantageous to the entire country and to contain no element of danger to any California interest, I would vote against it or resign my seat. No action was taken by the legislature, and in March I acted on my best judgment and voted to ratify the treaty. I believed then, as I believe now, that it is destined to expand the market for American products, which has been gradually closing against us through foreign competition, and that in this expansion California has a chance to profit, while there is no chance that she can be injured.

AN INCONSISTENCY.

In passing, I desire to call attention to a glaring inconsistency which is apparent here and there on the other side, but which has evidently escaped the notice of those who are afflicted with it. It is this: Some of my friends, like the Senator from Nevada, oppose this treaty, presumably, on the ground that it will expose certain productive industries of the United States to serious competition and hence to injury.

Yet, on the other hand, they believe that Cuba should be a part of the United States, and would support a movement to bring her under the American flag. Were this done, what would become of the protection to the great American industries they are now so anxious about—sugar, tobacco, and citrus fruits? Would not free sugar, free tobacco, and free oranges be far more disastrous than the slight reduction of tariff on those products as provided by the treaty we are considering? It seems to me that the advocates of annexation would be more consistent if they insisted that the proposed reductions were not sufficient to give that measure of prosperity to Cuba and ourselves which they must have in view when they favor the hoisting of the American flag over that island.

BENEFICIAL RESULTS OF RECIPROCITY.

If there is any doubt as to the effect of reciprocal reductions in tariff on the exports of the United States to Cuba, one has only to turn back to the time of James G. Blaine, whose theories of reciprocity were adopted by the Republican party and by it developed in practice. Reciprocity with Cuba under the terms of the tariff act of 1891 went into effect in September of that year, and it will be interesting and instructive to see what was the effect upon our export trade with Cuba. These exports from 1888 to 1890 averaged about \$11,000,000 per year. In 1891, which had only four months of reciprocity, they increased to over \$12,000,000. The year 1892, however, when reciprocity was in full swing, showed exports amounting to \$17,953,570, and the next year, 1893, to \$24,157,698. Our exports to Cuba doubled in two years.

In view of these figures and those of succeeding years which told another story, there is no wonder that the Republican national convention of 1896 condemned the repeal of the reciprocity measures by the Democratic party as a "national calamity." And in the platform which was then framed it demanded the renewal and extension of the reciprocity provisions of the tariff act which embodied Mr. Blaine's ideas on that subject. "Protection and reciprocity," said the platform, "are twin measures of Republican policy and go hand in hand. Democratic rule has recklessly struck down both and both must be reestablished."

It seems to me if that was good Republican doctrine in 1896 it is good doctrine now, because the tree is known by the fruit it bears, and the best results have accrued from it. A course taken in opposition to it will place us in the position of the Democratic party, whose course we have so vigorously condemned. It seems to me we are but carrying out Republican ideas in the treaty with Cuba, and that to refuse our sanction to it is to announce greater fealty to Democratic doctrines than to those of our own party.

In no respect is this proposed legislation in conflict with the Dingley tariff law. The rates fixed in 1897 on sugar and other products were largely specific on all products, and the law provides for reciprocal agreements or treaties with foreign nations on the basis of a 20 per cent reduction, and therefore I am not able to discover what objection any friend of the McKinley protective policy or the Dingley law can have to this legislation. There is no infraction of that statute in this Cuban bill or treaty.

BUSINESS SENSE, NOT SENTIMENT, SHOULD GOVERN.

As to Cuba herself, I think she has done too well to warrant us in being guided wholly by sentiment in our dealings with her. Our arms liberated her, and with our assistance she was set upon her feet. We fed her starving, clothed her naked, restored her finances, and gave her a rich revenue; we cleaned her cities, abolished disease, built roads, repaired her public works, and set her in the way of helping herself. And that she has made good use of the aid we gave her is made evident in the growing prosperity of her people. Her trade is expanding, wealth is being accumulated, and she is well started on the road to happiness and riches.

We as Republicans rejoice in her prosperity. And now we think that we have a right to share in some of the prosperity that we have rendered possible, and we support this treaty that we may not see all the fruits of our labors go to our industrial rivals. To secure a fighting chance to save our trade by a reciprocal tariff reduction which still safeguards all of our own interests is, it seems to me, our duty.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to enter into an elaborate discussion of the measure under consideration. I desire merely to define my position upon it, and to state the reasons which impel me in the action I shall take.

When the Philippine revenue bill was under discussion in this body during the last Congress, I submitted some remarks in which I attempted to show that those islands were not only extensive in area but that they were exceedingly rich and productive; that if we retained them as a permanent possession of this Government American capital and enterprise would inevitably go there and develop, clear, and bring under cultivation those rich lands; that development and cultivation would not be accomplished through and by the employment of native labor, because it was too lazy and shiftless, nor yet by white labor, because the white man can not successfully labor in that climate, but that that development and cultivation would be accomplished through the employment of Chinese labor, and to that end means would be found to suspend or repeal the anti-Chinese legislation applicable then and now to those islands.

I then pointed out that by reason of soil and climate those islands were especially adapted to the growth of sugar, rice, tobacco, and, perhaps, cotton, all of which are staple products in this country, and especially in the southern portion of the country. And I argued that in this way, through the policy of the Government and the employment of American capital, the agriculture of this country would be brought into competition with the richer soil of the Tropics, tilled and cultivated by the cheapest labor in the world.

I was then making an argument against the retention of the Philippine Islands, and in that connection I expressed the opinion that if the agricultural interest of those islands was ever developed so as to become seriously competitive with us it would be through the employment of American capital, and only in the event we should retain them; that it would never be done by native enterprise; for should we retire from the islands we would certainly guarantee their independence and thereby prevent them from falling into other hands.

Mr. President, I mention that matter in this connection because it may seem that the position which I then took is somewhat inconsistent with the position I shall take upon the measure now before the Senate, and there probably would be some inconsistency but for the fact that the situation with reference to Cuba is very different from the situation with reference to the Philippine Islands. The soil of Cuba is indeed rich, even richer than that of the Philippines, and it is likewise adapted to the growth of some of the staple crops of this country.

But there, Mr. President, the analogy between the two ceases. The agricultural interest of the Philippines is in a crude and primitive condition; that of Cuba is already in a tolerable state of development. If the agricultural interest of the Philippines is ever developed, it will have to be by the employment of outside capital; but, whether we annex Cuba or not, whether this legislation becomes effective or not, the agricultural interests of Cuba are going to be developed, either by American or European capital or by native enterprise. I think there can be nothing more certain than that.

But, Mr. President, whether the agricultural interest of Cuba shall be developed by American or European capital or by native enterprise, it will not be developed through the employment of Chinese labor. Cuba is not now using, never has, and, in my judgment, never will use Chinese labor.

In fact, there is not a single West Indian island that, to any extent, employs in its agriculture Chinese labor, and possibly, with one exception, there is no country in the world to-day, not excepting the South, chiefly dependent upon black labor, that uses Chinese labor.

I have simply said this, Mr. President, by way of explanation of my position upon these two subjects, bearing some relationship the one to the other.

Mr. President, I voted for the treaty and I am going to vote for this bill. But I did not vote for the treaty, neither do I intend to vote for this bill, upon any idea that Cuba is in distress and needs this legislation as a matter of grace. I did not believe at the time I voted for the treaty that Cuba was in distress. I thought then that under all the circumstances she was in a reasonably good condition.

I am sure that Cuba is not now in distress or need of charity from the United States. On the contrary, from the best information I have been able to obtain, I have reached the conclusion that the condition of Cuba to-day is one of comparative prosperity.

Neither am I going to vote for the bill on any assumption of national honor, duty, and obligation from this Government to Cuba. I agree entirely with the senior Senator from California [Mr. PERKINS], who has just taken his seat, that we have already done all that duty requires for that country and that people. We drove Spain from Cuba. We lifted the yoke of oppression from her neck. We gave her liberty and independence, and we helped her to establish a government republican in form at an expense to this country of something over \$300,000,000 and the sacrifice of many precious lives. That, I think, is the full measure of our duty; at least, Mr. President, it is more than any other nation has ever done for an alien people since the beginning of time.

I shall not vote for this legislation for any of these reasons nor for all of them combined. I shall vote for it in part because I think it will be a great advantage to Cuba, and we ought to be glad to help her if we can without injury to ourselves, because she is our neighbor and we are responsible for her national existence. I am going to vote for it in part because I believe it will be a means for the establishment of a desirable and permanent trade relationship between Cuba and this country.

But, Mr. President, my chief reason for voting for this measure is not that it will help Cuba, although I have no objection to doing that, and would be glad to help in doing it, but because, in my judgment, this legislation will be of great benefit to the people of the United States considered as a whole.

It is possible, I think highly probable, that the benefits which will accrue to us from this treaty will be very much greater in my State and section than in some other States and sections of this Union. But I will not vote for this measure for the reason intimated by one Senator on this floor, in speaking about certain southern Senators whose States were supposed to have a special interest in the adoption of the treaty; I am not going to vote for it because it will benefit my section particularly, but I am going

to vote for it because I believe that balancing all the advantages and disadvantages, for probably there are both advantages and disadvantages in connection with it, the sum total of benefits will be in the interest of the whole people of the United States.

Mr. President, it is suggested that this slight reduction in the duty upon sugar will destroy the sugar industry of this country. That is a familiar argument. It is an argument that we are in the habit of hearing in this Chamber and around this Capitol and from certain special interests in this country whenever it is suggested that there should be a repeal or reduction in any of the existing rates of tariff duties.

But that aside, I do not believe that this slight reduction of duty on sugar will destroy any sugar interest in this country or even materially cripple it. If I thought the passage of this bill would destroy the sugar industry of Louisiana or the beet industry of the West, or even materially cripple those industries, one or both, I would not care to vote for it. But I do not believe it will have that effect.

Everyone, I believe, admits that the passage of this bill and the reduction of the duty upon sugar will not affect, certainly in the immediate future, the price of sugar in this country, for everyone knows, and concedes, that the price of sugar in this country is the world's price of sugar, with the duty imposed by our tariff and the transportation in bringing it from other countries added.

If the treaty with Cuba becomes effective and the duty on Cuban sugar is reduced as therein provided, the price of sugar in this country will, other conditions being the same, continue the same it now is, and that price will be the price of sugar in Hamburg, where the world's price of sugar is regulated, plus the duty and freight to New York. The German and the Frenchman will get the same price for his sugar in this market; the American producer will get the same price for his sugar; the American consumer will get his sugar for no less; the Cuban will get the same price in our market for his sugar, but he will have a larger net profit than his foreign competitors, because he will not have to pay quite so much duty on his sugar sold in this country as will his foreign competitors.

But, Mr. President, the opponents of the proposed legislation, conceding the force of that argument, suggest that the passage of this bill will greatly stimulate the production of sugar in Cuba, thereby increasing the world's supply of sugar and pressing down the world's price of sugar, and as a result the American price of sugar.

That contention would undoubtedly be true if the increase in the production of sugar in Cuba as a result of the passage of this measure should be so great as to affect the world's price of sugar, and if that increase in production would not come about inevitably from other causes independently of this legislation and beyond our control.

Mr. President, can anyone who is familiar with the facts with reference to the possibilities of Cuba in the culture of sugar, whether this treaty becomes a law or not, whether this concession is granted to Cuba or not, doubt that that island will increase, and rapidly increase, its production of sugar until in the near future it reaches the full extent of its capabilities?

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. FOSTER], in his very able speech upon this subject delivered in this Chamber a few days ago, told us that the average output of sugar in Cuba per acre is about 2½ tons, worth, I am advised, in the markets of Cuba, on the plantation of the producer, at least \$100. Can anybody doubt that lands, easily cultivated as Cuban lands are, yielding an income of a hundred dollars an acre right upon the plantation will be developed to the fullest extent possible without tariff or artificial stimulation of any kind? I know it is suggested that if this measure is not passed the price of sugar in Cuba will possibly fall so low that the Cuban planters will be forced to go out of the sugar business and put their lands in something else besides sugar; but I do not think the facts sustain that contention.

Mr. President, we have in the western part of this country exceedingly fertile land adapted to the growth of wheat but not adapted to the growth of cotton. If the price of wheat in this country shall fall to 60 cents and the price of cotton shall go up to 15 cents, those lands will probably continue to be cultivated in wheat. We have exceedingly rich lands in the South adapted to the cultivation of cotton but not to the growth of wheat. If the price of cotton go down to 5 cents a pound and the price of wheat go up to a dollar or a dollar and a quarter a bushel, those lands will probably continue to be cultivated in cotton, and why? Simply because there is nothing else to do but to cultivate cotton. There is like diversity of soil in Cuba. Some of her lands are especially adapted to the growth of sugar, but they will not successfully produce tobacco. For the same reason that the South continued to grow cotton when it went to 5 cents, below the cost of production, Cuba will continue in the cultivation of sugar, though it fall below the price of profitable culture as compared with other lines of agriculture.

Mr. President, I doubt very much whether Cuba will ever produce, as is contended it can produce, enough sugar to supply the American demand, which will increase as Cuban production of sugar increases, but if she is capable of producing enough sugar for that purpose I have no doubt she will produce it whether she gets these tariff concessions from us or not.

Mr. President, I know that the sugar producers of this country, especially those of Louisiana, are not upon an equality in all respects with Cuba in the production of sugar. In some respects, however, there is apparently an equal condition, especially in the case of Louisiana. There is substantially the same condition as to the kind of labor employed in Louisiana and in Cuba, and about the same condition as to the price of labor applies in Cuba and in Louisiana. The kind of labor employed in Louisiana is the native white labor and black labor. The kind of labor employed in Cuba is native white and black labor.

From the best information I have been able to obtain, and I have made quite a thorough search, the wages paid labor in the sugar fields of Louisiana range from \$15 to \$20 per month. The rate of wages paid labor in the cane fields of Cuba ranges from \$15 to \$25 per month, the difference being slightly in favor of Louisiana in that respect.

I know, that there is a disparity to Louisiana's disadvantage in the soil and possibly in climatic conditions. The soil of that island is richer than that of Louisiana. It averages a greater yield per acre than that of Louisiana. But, Mr. President, difference in fertility of soil is not always nor generally an insuperable obstacle to successful competition. To draw another illustration from this country, my State and a number of other Southern States will not yield near so much per acre in corn as the rich lands of Kansas and other western corn-growing States possibly will not yield over one-half as much per acre, and yet with free trade between the States North Carolina raises and sells corn in competition with Kansas and makes a living profit upon it.

My State will not produce nearly so much cotton per acre as the State of Texas, and yet, Mr. President, we have been making and we are making cotton to-day in competition with Texas, and at a good profit.

The Senator from Louisiana told us the other day that the average output of the sugar lands of his State was about 1 ton of sugar per acre. From the best information I have been able to obtain the output of the beet-sugar States ranges from 2 to 2½ tons of sugar per acre. The price of these different kinds of sugar is about the same. With this great disparity between the output of sugar in Louisiana and the beet-sugar States of this country, with absolute free trade in domestic products in the home market, Louisiana during all these years has been able to meet this domestic competition and sustain itself in the cultivation of cane sugar.

I have no doubt, Mr. President, as I said before, the soil of Cuba is more fertile and better adapted to the growth of sugar than that of this country. But that is a disadvantage which we have to contend with in competition with tropical countries in other things as well as sugar; but the superior thrift, efficiency, and intelligence of labor the Temperate Zone over labor in the Tropics has generally been able to overcome these disadvantages of soil and make competition successful which would otherwise be impossible.

But, if our boasted superiority in labor conditions and machinery conditions is not sufficient to enable us to overcome these disadvantages in competition with Cuban sugar, then I submit that after we have taken 20 per cent off of the duty on sugar in favor of Cuba there will still remain an ample duty to counterbalance any disadvantage growing out of better conditions of soil and climate.

I have been taught, and I believe, that the Dingley tariff is an abomination; that it is exorbitant and excessive taxation, and that after levying a sufficient sum to make up the difference between the labor and the material cost between this country and competing countries it imposes heavy additional duties, in many instances for no other purposes than private enrichment.

The average ad valorem duty upon this highly protective measure is only about 57 per cent, I believe. The present duty upon sugar is about 87 per cent, or about 80 per cent in excess of the average Dingley rate. After deducting the 20 per cent conceded to Cuba by this legislation, there will still remain a duty upon sugar of about 69 per cent—I have not made the calculation accurately, but that is approximately correct, I think—leaving a duty upon sugar after this reduction of 12 per cent above the average Dingley rate. I submit that is enough protection to overcome the differences in conditions of sugar cultivation here and in Cuba. If it is not, then sugar can not be produced in this country on conditions just to the American consumer of sugar.

My State is a great tobacco-producing State. I believe there are about thirty counties in my State in which tobacco is one of the chief agricultural products. Last year three towns in my section of the State, within 50 miles of each other, each sold on their warehouses nearly 20,000,000 pounds of leaf tobacco. Last year the manufacturers of my State manufactured over 100,000,000 pounds of leaf tobacco.

This bill reduces the duty upon tobacco to the same extent that it does upon sugar. And yet I am not complaining. I stand ready to vote for the bill. Why? Because if the tobacco of my State needs protection against Cuban tobacco the present tariff upon tobacco is about 78 per cent ad valorem, 21 per cent above the average Dingley rate, and after deducting the 20 per cent conceded to Cuba by this legislation there will still remain a duty of about 65 per cent upon Cuban tobacco imported into this country, or about 8 cents more than the average Dingley tariff rate. It seems to me this is sufficient to overcome any disadvantage in competition with Cuba. At least it is but a moderate reduction from what appears to be a high rate of protection.

Mr. President, I would not contend for a minute that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. FOSTER] and other Democratic Senators who have opposed any reduction of the present Dingley rate as it applies to sugar are to be taken as advancing protection theories when they make the contention that any reduction in those rates in favor of Cuba will destroy the sugar industry of their section. I understand, and we all understand, and it is a natural feeling, and one entirely justifiable, that if high protective rates are to obtain in this country they should not be applied with discrimination toward any industry or toward any section. If that policy is to obtain, then it is perfectly natural for Louisiana to come here and to demand that she shall be given her share of the bounty. I appreciate that argument. I can sympathize with it. But, this is but a moderate reduction from an exceedingly high rate of duty, and I must confess I do not feel the force of the argument when applied to the legislation under consideration.

Mr. President, I said that I was going to vote for this bill chiefly because, in my judgment, after counterbalancing all the advantages and disadvantages, it would, I believed, be greatly in the interest of the people of this country. I want to address myself for a few moments to that phase of the subject.

The senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER], in the very interesting speech made by him upon this subject the other day, informed the Senate that Cuba was the richest island in the world. I think he might have said the richest country in agricultural possibilities in the world. He informed us that even under present conditions, only two or three years out of a devastating and destructive civil war, with its labor demoralized, to-day Cuba's exports per capita were four or five times greater than ours. Undoubtedly that is true, Mr. President. Cuba does not only export per capita more than we do, but I think more than any other nation in the world.

With the return of prosperity, with the establishment of normal conditions, and with just and wise laws and administration, the yearly output of Cuba will rapidly increase, and her export trade will correspondingly grow. In fact, Mr. President, in a little over two years, less than three, the sugar exports of Cuba have risen from less than 400,000 tons to a million tons. What does all this mean, Mr. President? It means that in the near future Cuba is going to be an enormously rich country. But Cuba is an agricultural country, and will continue to be an agricultural country, and her agricultural products will continue to be confined chiefly to the production of sugar, tobacco, and fruits. With this great wealth will come new wants and the ability to supply these wants. Sugar, tobacco, and fruits won't feed the people of Cuba. Sugar, tobacco, and fruit won't clothe the people of Cuba. These things they must buy largely from other countries.

Cuban imports last year were, I believe, about \$60,000,000; probably a little more than that. I do not recollect.

Mr. CLAY. Nearly \$63,000,000.

Mr. SIMMONS. Nearly \$62,000,000 worth, the Senator from Georgia suggests to me. In the near future it may be predicted, within the five-year life of the proposed treaty, although I do not mean to go into the business of prophecy, but it may with reasonable certainty be predicted that within that time the import trade of Cuba will reach \$100,000,000. That is not, I think, too high an estimate. We now get only about 42 per cent of her import trade. The balance of it goes to European countries—to France, to Germany, to England, to Spain. If this treaty shall become operative by the passage of the pending bill, we shall be given in the Cuban markets an advantage in the sale of our goods ranging from 20 to 40 per cent over our German, our Spanish, and our English competitors, and with that advantage, instead of selling her \$25,000,000, as now, upon the basis of her present trade, we ought to sell her \$50,000,000 worth of our goods,

and in the life of this treaty we ought to sell her, instead of \$50,000,000 worth, \$80,000,000 or \$90,000,000 worth.

Cuba purchased last year about \$6,000,000 worth of cotton goods. Before this treaty expires she will buy over \$12,000,000 worth, I have no doubt. We now get only about \$400,000 worth of this cotton trade. With the advantage this treaty will give us over our European rivals (an advantage ranging from 30 to 40 per cent) we ought to sell Cuba all the cotton goods she consumes. Cuba uses the cheaper grades of cotton goods, such as we make in the South, such as we make in my State, where we are now manufacturing all the raw cotton we make. The treaty gives this class of goods a concession of 30 per cent. Knit goods, now largely made in my State, get a concession of 40 per cent.

With this advantage over our foreign competitors, when we are able to go to the Cubans and sell them our goods with this advantage over those competitors, can there be any doubt that we shall be able to control the import trade of Cuba?

Mr. President, we have been told by distinguished representatives of the Republican party in this debate that the reciprocity enunciated by Blaine, by Republican national conventions, and by the late lamented Mr. McKinley only extended to articles which we do not produce in this country—non-competitive articles. If that is a correct definition of Republican reciprocity, then this treaty manifestly does not illustrate Republican reciprocity. The Democratic party believes in low tariff. It believes the present high tariff rates should be revised and greatly reduced.

We have to raise in this country an enormous amount of money through customs duties to defray the necessary expenses of the Government. In levying those duties for this purpose, if provision is made for the actual and bona fide difference in labor and material cost in this country and in competing countries, that will not be wrong or unjust, but the Democratic party is in favor of pulling down, destroying, and trampling under foot all duties that are levied for the purpose of the enrichment of special interests.

With that definition of the Democratic idea of tariff, this bill, while not based and built upon the lines of Republican reciprocity, is, in my judgment, founded upon and builded upon the lines of Democratic tariff reduction, call it reciprocity or what not.

The junior Senator from California (Mr. BARD), who addressed the Senate upon this subject the other day in an exceedingly entertaining speech, in discussing the question of the possible control by our manufacturers of Cuba's import trade, said that even now, without this treaty, our manufacturers could control the Cuban market if they would only model their goods to suit the wants and the requirements of the Cuban people. That is true. It is equally true that if our manufacturers would model their goods so as to suit the wants and requirements of Central and South America they could control a large part of that valuable trade.

This is not a new idea. The trade journals have been presenting to our manufacturers this idea for some time. They are presumably entirely familiar with it, and I have no doubt they accept as true the proposition laid down by the Senator from California; but the fact remains that American manufacturers have not so modeled their goods as to suit the wants and requirements of these markets. Why? In the first place, the manufacturers of this country know that it is doubtful whether they could successfully turn the trade of those countries from established channels. Secondly, they know that even if they should succeed in getting that trade they would have to wrest it from Europe in a sharp and fierce competition, and that the profits would probably be nominal.

Besides these considerations, Mr. President, the expense of adjusting old machinery and purchasing new machinery in order to so model goods as to suit the wants of those people would be considerable. For these reasons our manufacturers, though probably just as thoroughly convinced as is the Senator from California that they could get these markets if they would do what he says is necessary to get them, have not seen fit to do these things. But suppose we should negotiate a treaty to-day with the countries of Central and South America by which we would be given an advantage over our European competitors in those markets of from 20 to 40 per cent, does any man doubt that our manufacturers would at once employ the means and incur the expense necessary to get that trade and that they would get it? The same is true with reference to Cuba. Give our manufacturers these concessions, give them this advantage of from 20 to 40 per cent over their English, German, and Spanish competitors, who are now getting 58 per cent of that trade, and our merchants will at once begin diligently to seek this trade. They will model their goods so as to suit the nicest and most delicate requirements of the Cuban consumer, and will incur any and every expense necessary to do that, and they will sell to Cuba practically all that she buys from abroad.

Mr. President, one more suggestion and I will have finished.

I have already spoken longer than I expected. The opponents of this measure tell us that this concession to Cuba will be a bounty pure and simple. I do not want to stickle about words or terms. I do not know whether or not it can be correctly and properly described as a bounty, but I do know that if it be a bounty to Cuba we will get from Cuba a bounty in return.

The difference in the two bounties will be against us in the beginning, but, Mr. President, if Cuba shall fulfill the just expectation of her friends and of intelligent men throughout the world during the next five years, I am inclined to think by the end of that time the balance of bounty will not only be in our favor but that it will be sufficiently in our favor to overcome any difference against us in the beginning.

But this much is certain, that, bounty or no bounty, it is not money taken out of the pockets of the people of this country. It is a mere remission of a tax, not as a gratuity, but in expectation of compensating benefits. If this bill does not pass, that tax will possibly be collected and go into the Treasury; but what need has the Treasury for it? It is already overflowing to the bursting point. It has already over \$200,000,000 more than it has any use for, and has only recently deposited in the national banks of this country over \$150,000,000 without interest, because there was no other way to get that money back into circulation and make it perform the functions for which it was created! The Treasury of the United States does not need this tax, but the people of the United States do need this trade, this increase of trade, which we may reasonably expect as a result of the passage of this bill and the remission of this small tax.

Mr. President, before I take my seat I want to say that I wish certain amendments might be made to this bill, but I recognize the fact that if any amendment should now be made it would destroy the treaty. But I do not want the opportunity to escape without expressing my condemnation of certain provisions of the bill. I am going to vote for it notwithstanding those provisions, because I think the good in it greatly overbalances the evils of it.

I especially object to what is known as the "five-years' clause," that clause by which we have stipulated that the Dingley rate of duty upon sugar shall not during the life of this treaty be reduced below its present rate. If I believed that that provision of the treaty and this bill is legal, is constitutional, would be legally operative, if I believed that it is binding upon the treaty-making power or the lawmaking power of this country, I would hesitate before voting for it. I would not care to sanction any such precedent as that, however great the benefits might be.

But, Mr. President, as a lawyer I know full well that as a legal proposition this Congress has no right or power to bind future Congresses; that the next Congress may reduce the rate of duty if it chooses to do so notwithstanding this five years' clause.

But it is said that provision is a part of the treaty and therefore part of a contract, and being part of a contract the faith and honor of the nation is pledged to its fulfillment and the keeping of its spirit and its letter. That argument has little force with me. Why? Because it is a contract between Cuba and the United States, and this provision was not put in the treaty for the benefit of Cuba, for certainly Cuba does not object to the reduction of duties provided in our sugar schedule; on the contrary, Cuba is asking now that they be reduced, and she would be glad to see every cent of protection taken off of sugar imported into this country.

It would be, therefore, no violation of faith with Cuba to reduce the duty on sugar, but would be just exactly what Cuba would like to have done. If it be said that it is the result of an understanding with the beet-sugar and the cane-sugar growers of this country, my answer is that if there had to be made such an understanding as that to secure the consent of this interest to this legislation, everybody connected with that understanding knows, or should know, that Congress has no right to make any such promise and write it in the laws of the country, and they can not complain if the next Congress disregards that which this Congress has no right to do.

There are other provisions of this treaty, Mr. President, to which I object, but I shall not take the time of the Senate in their discussion.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, when a bill which is seemingly, at least, at variance with ancient, time-honored, and time-tried Republican principles, is to be enacted into law by a Republican Congress, it seems to me that it becomes not only a right, but a moral duty for every Republican who votes for the passage of the measure to give his reasons for so seemingly departing from the tenets of his own party.

Not all the reasoning nor all the eloquence of the Senators who have interested us and who have sought to enlighten us upon this proposition can bring the terms of this bill to harmonize with absolute protection to our own home industries, and the very most that can be said of it is that it leaves them protected to a

certain degree, four-fifths as great as they would be protected without this bill.

Mr. President, that means one of two things; either the tariff schedules upon sugar and tobacco and other Cuban products which we have carried upon our Dingley tariff act for years have been too high, or more than necessary for absolute protection, or else if we modify them they will be less than adequate. One of these two propositions must be adopted. I believe there are few Republican Senators who do not stand exactly pat upon this tariff schedule, and if it is good for the balance of the world, there must be some special reason why it is not equally good when we consider our relations with the Cuban trade.

We seek to explain our deviation from these ancient rules of our party on one or all of three separate grounds: First, that, having by our own actions freed Cuba from the dominion of her home Government, having released her from the tyrannous acts of the Spanish Government, a moral duty, as well as a sense of national pride and national consistency, demands that we should, so far as lies in our power, see also that she have greater prosperity than she had under the Spanish rule, and that her people be made more prosperous and more happy; second, that by reason of the reciprocal diminution of our own tariffs upon our own products imported into Cuba we will reap a benefit that will correspond, at least, with our losses; and third, that by our own act or by our own influence we induced the Cuban Government to surrender a part of her own independence to this country, giving us control over her internal and external affairs, and that she did so with the understanding, at least, that we would give her some reciprocal benefits in the markets of our own country.

Mr. President, the first proposition must be answered in the negative. We owe the island of Cuba absolutely nothing. For hundreds of years she had to tug at the tether which bound her to the Spanish Government, and when by our action we severed those bonds it was never understood for a single moment that we should further, at our own expense, make those people happy and prosperous. It was understood when we took our first steps toward the breaking of those bonds that we would shield that country against foreign aggression; that we would apply to it our Monroe doctrine; that she should be shielded not only against external dangers but possibly against internal anarchy, but beyond that our duty did not go for a single moment.

Mr. President, national pride and national sense of justice will not allow us for a single moment to see this foster child, which we have wrested from an unnatural parent, suffer any great loss or be subject to the control or influence of any foreign country. But beyond that I say we did not agree to protect her. It was not expected that the moment we changed the national condition of the island the national character of those people would change. The world knew and we knew the natural instability of Spanish-American republics, and it was never thought that by reason of the sudden change of national character those people would suddenly take upon themselves Anglo-Saxon reliability and adaptability for self-government or Teutonic frugality and industry. That was not in the least expected by us.

With a country and a climate capable of producing with the same amount of labor, with an equal amount of expended energy, from three to five times what may be produced in our own country, it was never expected that we should continue this island always prosperous at our own expense. There is such a thing as philanthropy gone daft; and when, in a case of this character, we exercise so very much concern for the commercial interest of Cuba at the expense of our own, and at a time when every Senator understands that its coffers are full, that the conditions there are better than they have ever been known in the history of the island, I submit that it is crowding very close to the line.

I am aware that our duty did not cease with the close of the war; that having by our own act broken the bonds which united that country to the mother country it was our duty also to protect her against foreign aggression, and possibly it was further incumbent upon us as a neighbor to see that she had good, stable government in the island; but what I insist upon is that there was no duty imposed upon us to keep her prosperous at our own expense.

Mr. President, our sugar-beet growers labor from ten to twelve hours per day. Not only do they themselves do that, but it is true of every chick and child that is able to pull a weed or lift a beet.

Now, is it just or proper that we should take these laborious people, even supposing they are making a profit to-day, and say to them they shall share that profit with the Cuban laborer, who does not work ten hours or twelve hours in an entire week. That is upon the supposition that our people can stand this reduction. I believe they can stand a reduction of 20 per cent and still make a profit out of the sugar-beet industry. Every American farmer

must not only labor in the field during the day, in the heat of the summer, for ten or twelve hours, but he must, in order to live in a country like ours, make more and receive greater profits than he would if he lived in the island of Cuba, and that should be taken into consideration in our relations with the new Cuban Republic. I am straight and squarely against the proposition that the American farmer, who labors for this length of time, should divide his profits, even admitting that he has a goodly profit and more than he may be entitled to from the standpoint of reciprocity, with the Cuban laborer.

Why is a tariff ever necessary between two countries? It must be based on one or all of three simple propositions: That labor in this country is higher than it is in the country against which we levy our import duties; second, that the amount of labor required to produce an article is greater than in that country; and third, that the standard of living in this country is very much higher, and it requires a greater amount of labor and a greater profit in order that a man may exist, and exist well, in his home community.

When we compare these conditions so far as they concern our Cuban trade relations, every one of these propositions is glaringly obvious. Like all lands in other than tropical regions, our lands will not produce by themselves. They are not self-productive in foods of any character or in other articles that amount to anything. Everything that we get out of mother earth is obtained by constant, continuous, and arduous toil in order to lure it from the earth.

The condition is entirely different in Cuba. Should we, therefore, as a nation and as a people be compelled to put ourselves in actual competition with a people who require so little? Not only this, but every American farmer must build a good substantial home. He must expend large sums for fuel and clothing, and why, as a matter of duty and justice, should he be compelled to compete with the people of a nation who live outside the greater portion of the time, whose cost of fuel is practically nothing, and whose epidermis answers for clothing the greater portion of the year? I submit, therefore, that upon the ground of justice alone we are not bound to grant this concession to Cuba.

But, Mr. President, the ardent friends of this measure assure us that if at our own expense we make the Cuban people prosperous—that is, if we take out of the profits of the sugar-beet raisers and the tobacco growers of this country enough to make the Cuban people prosperous—the latter will buy more of our goods. That is one way of seeking a foreign market for our goods; but it is a method which has never before been adopted by the American people, and I doubt if we will ever again try the experiment. The sacrifice is not justified by any of the conditions as they appear to us. When we look over our trade relations with Cuba during the period of reciprocity, and before and after that period, we find that in every instance, while reciprocity has given us but a little benefit, it has given the foreign country a benefit far in excess of that which we have received.

The Senator from California [Mr. PERKINS], who so seductively enlightened us on this question a few moments ago, saw fit to give some of the figures in relation to our relations with Cuba prior to, during, and after our reciprocity arrangement. He gave only one side of them, however, and I think he will pardon me if I quote the other side. I will take 1890, before reciprocal relations were established. In that year Cuba exported to this country \$53,801,591; we exported to Cuba in the year 1890 \$13,084,415. The balance of trade against us was \$40,717,176. Now we will run over to 1892, when the reciprocal law was in force. We sold Cuba \$13,953,570 worth, approximately the same as before, but she sold us \$77,993,671 worth, increasing the balance of trade against us to \$60,040,101. Taking the next year, we raised our trade somewhat. We sold Cuba in the year 1893 \$24,157,698 worth. She sold us \$78,706,506 worth, and there was a balance of trade against us of \$54,548,908. Taking the last year, 1894, Cuba sold to us \$75,678,261 worth, and we sold to her \$20,125,321 worth, giving a balance of trade in her favor of \$55,552,940.

Then we come to 1895. The balance of trade against us dropped down immediately to \$40,063,598. In 1896 the balance of trade against us was only \$32,476,850. In 1898 it had dropped down to \$5,670,821. Taking the last year, 1902, the balance of trade was only \$8,071,184. In other words, under present conditions the balance of trade is \$8,071,184, as against \$60,040,101 in 1892. And where has the change been? Let us glance at the figures for a single moment. I will take our exports to Cuba.

In 1890 they were \$13,084,415; in 1892, \$13,953,570; in 1893, \$24,157,698; in 1894, \$20,125,321; in 1895, \$12,807,661; in 1896, \$7,530,880; in 1897, \$8,259,776; in 1898, \$9,561,656; in 1899, \$18,616,877; in 1900, \$26,513,400; in 1901, \$25,964,808; in 1902, \$26,623,500. So we see that our exports to Cuba to-day are far more than they were when she was selling us \$77,000,000 worth of goods.

I will ask permission to insert this table in my remarks.
The table referred to is as follows:

Cuban exports and imports.

Year.	Imports.	Exports.	Excess of imports.
1890	\$53,801,591	\$13,084,415	\$40,717,176
1892	77,993,671	13,953,570	60,040,101
1893	78,706,506	24,157,698	54,548,808
1894	75,678,261	20,125,821	55,552,440
1895	52,871,299	12,807,661	40,063,638
1896	40,017,730	7,530,880	32,476,850
1897	18,406,815	8,259,776	10,147,039
1898	15,232,477	9,561,656	5,670,821
1899	25,408,828	18,616,377	6,792,451
1900	31,371,704	26,513,400	4,858,304
1901	43,423,088	25,964,808	17,458,280
1902	34,694,684	26,623,500	8,071,184

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. McCUMBER. With great pleasure.

Mr. PERKINS. If my friend will permit me, during the years to which he has referred there was a reciprocity treaty by which sugar from Cuba virtually came into this country free. We were paying 2 cents a pound bounty upon sugar produced in this country. The other years that he refers to were those during the civil war in Cuba, and of course trade naturally fell off.

Mr. McCUMBER. The falling off in the trade is more with the Cuban trade than with our own. Her trade has been subject to every character of exigency. Sometimes it has been great; the next year it has been much smaller; but the figures as a whole show that Cuba has benefited far more than we have under our reciprocal arrangements.

Mr. President, the real benefit which one country obtains in its trade with another is not so much the volume of trade as it is the surplus in its favor. The things which we trade to another country are for the most of a perishable character. We sell abroad \$60,000,000 worth of breadstuffs and fabrics from our factories, and they are gone in a year. We receive in sugar, tobacco, and other produce \$60,000,000 worth, and they are gone in a year. But give us \$60,000,000 worth of balance of trade which is paid in gold dollars and we have something that is good to-day, good to-morrow, and good for a hundred years from to-day. What has given us all our great prosperity in the last five years? Has it been so much the volume of trade between the States or the great volume between this country and other countries? No; it has been in the vast volume of the balance of that trade.

Give us \$60,000,000—gold dollars—in balance of trade a year from the old country landed on this side of the water, and continue that for five years and we have \$2,500,000,000 in substantial property, property that remains here, and that is the character of trade for which we should always look. That, I repeat, is what has given us the great prosperity in the last five years. While a certain proportion of that vast sum of money, of course, has gone back in the payment of interest on bonds, and has been expended by tourists in the old country, a great portion of it has remained here. It has filled up our banks to overflowing; it has given confidence to our speculators and our business men; it has raised the price of our commodities from 25 to 500 per cent; it has filled the whole country with prosperity during all this time. It has not been because of the volume of trade, but because of the surplus of our exports over our imports. When we apply that to Cuba, it simply makes a leak for so much more profit.

But there is another side to this question, and a side which sinks deep into the heart and conscience of every American citizen who takes pride in his country beyond the mere question of financial gain or loss, and that is the honor of the country itself. We received from Cuba when she adopted her constitution certain concessions. She not only made herself perpetually the ward of this country; not only was this country made her guardian for all time, not merely over her external but her internal relations, but she also contracted to give us a coaling station, placing herself entirely at our mercy.

Now, what induced her to do this? The understanding, express or implied, that in lieu of what she had granted to us—and certainly there can be no greater grant than that of absolute independence—she would receive not only protection abroad, but in our country a market for her goods which would not be accorded to the balance of the world. I know there are many present here who will say that neither a Representative nor a Senator nor the President himself had the right to induce those people to that belief. Mr. President, that does not answer the question. As residents of a Spanish-American country those people understood that whatever was the wish of the head of any country there

would be a Congress which would accede to those wishes and that she would receive what she contracted for.

What else would induce her to do this? Some of my friends tell me that she would have done this simply because we agreed to protect her. She did not have to surrender her independence in order to get that promise from us. Cuba knew of our Monroe doctrine. She knew that it protected her against all foreign invasion; that it cleared her path of all foreign difficulties. She did not believe that she needed us to take care of her internal affairs. She did not struggle for two hundred years against Spanish rule without the belief or understanding that she could take care of her own affairs. Therefore there was but one thing that weighed heavily upon her, and that was the question of providing a market for her home products.

We received that benefit. Is there a Senator here to-day who would surrender it if he could? Would he give back to Cuba her absolute independence, her control over her foreign relations, and over her internal affairs? Would he yield to her again our coaling station and our naval base which we have established there? If he would not, then there is but one thing in honor that he can do, and that is to pay the price for which these things were given.

Upon that theory, and upon it alone, I shall vote for this bill—upon the proposition that we are bound in honor either to return what we have received from Cuba or give her certain concessions upon her products when imported into our own country.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. President, I am led to ask the indulgence of the Senate for a short time by reason of a colloquy that occurred before the close of the session yesterday between the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and my colleague [Mr. TELLER], in which the exclusion of Chinese from Cuba was the topic. In the course of my colleague's remarks he discussed the cheapening effect of Chinese labor upon the principal product of Cuba and the necessary evil result it would have when its products were brought into competition with American sugar unless duties to counterbalance the low price of Cuban labor were retained.

The junior Senator from Massachusetts evidently felt the logic of the argument, and that if the claims of my colleague were not impaired his argument would go with peculiar force to the farmers of the country, especially to the farmers of the great Northwest and of the Pacific coast. He appreciated that it could not conduce to Republican popularity in any section of the country if the agriculturists should realize that the policy of the Republican party brought what the agriculturist produced into direct competition with the product of coolly labor from other countries with little attempt by the dominant party to counter-vail against the cheap labor.

The question of Chinese labor in Cuba is a very important one in connection with this Cuban controversy, for certainly if the sugar fields of Cuba are to be tilled by Chinese labor and the protection afforded by the present tariff to American sugar is to be seriously impaired, then I submit that the sugar industry of the United States, whether it be cane or beet sugar, has been dealt a serious blow.

Toward the close of the session yesterday the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] said:

I observed in the speech of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER]—and I have looked it up to see if I was correct about it—some remarks he made in regard to Chinese labor in which I think he must have overlooked the facts as they are. The Senator from Colorado said:

"As it stands to-day Cuba may import Chinamen or Japanese or any other Asiatic servile labor that they see fit in any numbers they may wish."

Then the Senator from Massachusetts continued:

Under the military government of the United States our laws excluding the Chinese were put in force—in fact, were enacted there under that government, and have been adopted by the present Government of Cuba. In other words, our laws about the Chinese are in force in the island to-day—

Mr. TELLER. I think differently.

Mr. LODGE. Unless they have been repealed very lately.

Mr. TELLER. I think not. I want to show the Senator that Chinamen are now going into Cuba, if I can turn to the matter—

Mr. LODGE. I made some inquiry in regard to it, and I will show the Senator the law in a moment. I have sent for it.

Mr. TELLER. I knew that was the law, but I find the statement here that some Chinamen have gone there this year.

Mr. LODGE. Under our law some Chinamen may come into the United States.

Mr. TELLER. I do not believe that law is in force in Cuba.

Mr. LODGE. Our law was adopted there. The only information I was able to get—and I will say that I might have got it in greater detail, but I have not had the time—was from the Cuban minister, who informed me that the law of Cuba to-day is exactly the same as our law about the exclusion of the Chinese; that it had not been changed in any way, and that no Chinese labor could be imported. That is my authority for making the statement, and I assume that the Cuban minister knew about the action of his own Government.

I am not prepared, Mr. President—

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator allow me a moment?

Mr. PATTERSON. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. I do not know whether the Senator was in the Chamber this morning—

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. But this morning I put in the RECORD, first, the general military order, then the enactment of the military government, which enacted by sections our entire Chinese immigration law, and then a statement from the Bureau of Insular Affairs that the State Department reported that those laws are still in force. I made further inquiry of the Cuban minister in order to confirm that statement, and he did confirm it. He says the law has not been changed in any way, and that Chinese laborers can not be imported into Cuba any more than they may be imported into this country; that the laws are the same.

Mr. PATTERSON. I wish to say to the Senator from Massachusetts that I have before me the documents to which he referred, and I intend to refer to them. If any stress is laid upon the sentence that "Chinese labor can not be imported," then perhaps he may have reached a correct conclusion. But it is not a question of the right to import Chinese labor. It is the question of Chinese immigration. In the United States we not only prohibit the importation of Chinese, but we prohibit the immigration of Chinese.

Mr. LODGE. That is the precise law in Cuba, prohibiting the immigration. There are three or four sections there.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PETTUS in the chair). The Senator from Massachusetts ought to address the Chair.

Mr. PATTERSON. I will come to it all in time. I can not cover everything in a few moments. But there is a serious mistake somewhere, for if the Senator is right the House of Representatives, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, and different Departments of the Government have been laboring under a singular delusion about Chinese immigration into the island of Cuba.

Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts this morning presented the letter, to which he refers with proper introductory remarks, for insertion in the RECORD. It is a letter dated at the Bureau of Insular Affairs of the War Department, December 13, 1903, and is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF INSULAR AFFAIRS,
Washington, December 15, 1903.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In obedience to your telephone request, I hasten to inclose herewith order No. 155, headquarters Department of Cuba, Habana, May 15, 1902, issued by General Wood, the approval of the Secretary of War having been previously given thereto, and call to your attention sections 7 and 8 thereof, prohibiting the immigration of Chinese.

I would furthermore call to your attention the inclosed circular, No. 13, Division of Customs and Insular Affairs, War Department, Washington, April 14, 1899, putting into effect the United States immigration laws in Cuba.

I have just made inquiry at the State Department, and they tell me that as far as they have any knowledge this order of May 15, 1902, has not in any wise been modified since our occupation ceased.

Very sincerely,

CLARENCE R. EDWARDS,
Colonel, United States Army, Chief of Bureau.

Hon. H. C. LODGE,
United States Senate.

I take it, Mr. President, that the circular No. 13, of date April 14, 1899, referred to in Colonel Edwards's letter, is fully as effective in prohibiting the immigration of Chinese into Cuba as the later order of Governor-General Wood dated May 15, 1902. They are both orders of officers of the United States. They both relate to a country of which we were in but temporary occupation.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes, sir.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. The first one is an order. The second one, if the Senator will look at the beginning, is an enactment under the form in which they were all enacted during our occupation. It is not merely a military order. It is an unimportant point, but it was enacted; and all those enactments under the military government were adopted by the Cuban Government subsequently.

Mr. PATTERSON. I suppose the Senator from Massachusetts will admit that so long as the United States Army occupied Cuba, and before the order of May 15, 1902, was made, the order of April 14, 1899, was as effective in prohibiting the immigration of Chinese into Cuba as that of May 15, 1902. To see whether order No. 155 of Governor-General Wood is an enactment, I desire to read its introduction:

I, Leonard Wood, military governor of Cuba, by virtue of the authority vested in me, direct the publication of and hereby reenact in such form as to enable their continued enforcement, pending such action as the Congress of Cuba may take thereon, the following provisions of law relating to immigration.

This is a new model for legislative enactments. Following what I read is a number of sections, and among them Sections VII and VIII, to which the Senator from Massachusetts particularly referred.

Now, what we have is this: An enactment by General Wood in the form of an order. By it he reenacts, to use the language of Governor-General Wood, a certain order relating to immigration

into the island of Cuba of the year 1899. That is all. To create the belief that that has resulted in permanent Chinese-exclusion laws by Cuba the insular department, in its letter to the Senator from Massachusetts, says:

I have just made inquiry at the State Department and they tell me that as far as they have any knowledge this order of May 13, 1902, has not in any wise been modified since our occupation ceased.

Somewhat evasive language, I suggest. It falls far short of a statement that such laws do exist.

Before I proceed further I desire to call the attention of the Senate to a report sent by the acting chief of the insular division to the senior Senator from Connecticut, Hon. ORVILLE H. PLATT, in which is contained the statistics of immigration into Cuba for the fiscal year 1901. That was when the order of 1899 was in full force and effect; when, according to the Senator from Massachusetts, Chinese exclusion was in full operation. By these statistics we find that, except from Spain, there was a larger immigration from China into Cuba that year than from any other country. Every country upon the face of the globe is apparently given in this table. We discover from it that of Americans there were 514 immigrants, that there were but 349 Cubans, there were 725 Porto Ricans, there were 14,808 Spaniards, but from China there was an immigration of 756 persons.

The Senator from Massachusetts suggested that Chinese may come into this country now under our exclusion laws. That is true, but will the Senator from Massachusetts suggest that Chinese laborers may come into this country? Certain specified classes may come into this country, and then under many most effective restrictions, certainly not laborers. When we turn to an additional table we find that of the 756 Chinese who immigrated into Cuba in 1901, 398 were laborers, 320 were merchants, dealers, and others of like callings, so that with an alleged Chinese-exclusion law in effect in Cuba in 1901, with the United States in full and undisputed possession of the island, we find in the face of the laws that over 750 Chinese immigrated into that island, of whom more than one-half were ordinary Chinese laborers.

I take it, Mr. President, that, having in mind the necessity for labor in Cuba and the manner of the enactment of this so-called law, it will not be any more rigidly enforced in the future than it was while the United States was in possession of the island. I want to show to the Senator that he is the only one in either branch of Congress who up to this time has had the temerity to even intimate that there are Chinese-exclusion laws now in force in the island of Cuba. The Cuban reciprocity bill of the Fifty-seventh Congress, which was the forerunner of the treaty bill now under discussion, was prepared and introduced by Mr. PAYNE, who is the Republican leader on the floor of the House and chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. That bill in its first section provided as follows:

That for the purpose of securing reciprocal trade relations with Cuba, the President is hereby authorized, as soon as may be after the establishment of an independent government in Cuba—

Mark the language—

and the enactment by said Government of immigration and exclusion laws as fully restrictive of immigration as the laws of the United States, to enter into negotiations with said Government, etc.

The House chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means on March 19, 1902, it is very evident, was not aware that anyone would suggest that exclusion laws at that time existed in Cuba.

Again, in the body of the bill, Mr. PAYNE—its author—says:

And whenever the Government of Cuba shall enact such immigration and exclusion laws, and shall enter into such commercial agreement with the United States, and shall make such concessions in favor of the products and manufactures thereof as aforesaid, and which agreement, in the judgment of the President, shall be reciprocal and equivalent, he shall be authorized to proclaim such facts, both as to the enactment of such immigration and exclusion laws and the making of such agreement; and thereafter until the 1st day of December, 1903, the imposition of the duties now imposed by law on all articles imported from Cuba, the products thereof, into the United States shall be suspended, and in lieu thereof there shall be levied, collected, and paid upon all such articles imported from Cuba 80 per cent of the rate of duty now levied upon like articles imported from foreign countries.

So if the law that passed the House at the last Congress and came to the Senate, and now sleeps the sleep of death with the Committee on Foreign Relations, had gone into effect, it would have provided that there should be no reciprocity between Cuba and the United States until the President had become satisfied that Cuba had enacted just such exclusion laws as are on the statute books of the United States.

Then, further, Mr. President, this bill that represented the views of the chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means, and no doubt represented the views of his Republican colleagues, provided that—

The President shall have power, and it shall be his duty, whenever he shall be satisfied that either such immigration or exclusion laws or such agreement mentioned in this act are not being fully executed by the Government of Cuba, to notify such Government thereof, and thereafter there shall be levied, collected, and paid upon all articles imported from Cuba the full rate of duty provided by law upon articles imported from foreign countries.

That is pretty strong testimony as to the true state of the law; that is, the absence of exclusion laws in Cuba. The bill went to the Committee on Ways and Means, and it was reported back from the committee, retaining practically the identical provisions to which I have called the Senate's attention.

I will not stop to read the provisions of the bill as reported, but I desire to read in this connection the report of the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means that accompanied the bill as it was reported from that committee and put before the House for its consideration.

On page 4 of this report I find the following:

On the hearings before the committee it was generally conceded that no loss would accrue to our own sugar industry unless in the course of a few years the reduction in duty should stimulate the production of sugar in Cuba to such an extent that she should increase her product and be able to supply all the sugar we import from foreign countries. It also appeared that this is impossible unless she was able to import more laborers, and the fear was generally expressed that she might import cheap Asiatic labor to such an extent as to interfere with our home production. For this reason—

Because it might disastrously affect the agriculturists engaged in the cultivation of the sugar beet—

For this reason the requirement was placed in the bill that she should adopt immigration and exclusion laws as restrictive as our own laws on these subjects. This would effectually check the immigration of cheap labor. But under the time limit of the present bill every danger of future injury to our own industries is entirely eliminated.

Mark the language, Mr. President. The report not only gives the reasons why the Republican majority of the House of Representatives of the last Congress insisted that Cuba should enact restrictive immigration laws as strong in every way as our own, but the statement is made that—

Under the time limit of the present bill every danger of future injury to our own industries is entirely eliminated.

Surely, Mr. President, in view of the bill as introduced by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the other House, in view of the bill as reported, in view of the report of the majority of that committee, in view of the free immigration of Chinese into Cuba in 1901, and in view of the evasive and non-committal character of whatever communications have been read here, there is little room to doubt but that Cuba is as open to Chinese to-day as is the Chinese Empire.

But this fact should be noticed in this connection. The reciprocity provided for in the bill that passed the House of Representatives and was sent to the Senate during the last Congress expired by its express terms on the 1st of the month. Relief was then deemed necessary for Cuba but for a little over a year; relief was to cover but two crops of sugar in Cuba. In addition to the short duration of the convention, less than two years from the time it would have been enacted if it had gone through, however speedily, we have provisions to safeguard the industries of the sugar-beet farmer requiring that Chinese should be rigidly excluded from the island. It was the equivalent of the expression of a conviction by the Republican House of Representatives, if not of the Republican members of the Senate, that there should be no lowering of the wall of protection around the sugar producers of this country, however slight, unless there was an absolute certainty that a law would be enacted by Cuba to prevent the introduction of the cheap labor that would enable the Cuban sugar to so undersell American sugar as to arrest the development of the great new American industry.

Mr. President, what interests intervened to induce the President to omit these provisions for Chinese exclusion from this treaty? The Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] correctly expressed the situation in his remarkably clear and forceful and lucid speech yesterday. The action of the President in taking this whole question of change in our tariff laws from Congress, where it properly belonged, and while the House bill was yet being considered by the proper Senate committee and covering the same identical things as were in the bill by treaty with Cuba, was an insult to the House of Representatives, to which body is given the sole power to originate revenue measures.

But, Mr. President, in addition to that this bill which the House has sent to the Senate not only decreases the safeguards that the bill of the last Congress provided for the agriculturists of the country, but it increases the time for which this tariff reduction is to extend to about three times that which was fixed by the Administration bill of the last Congress. If the President of the United States believed when, through his Secretary of State, this treaty was negotiated that these carefully worded provisions in the House bill with reference to Chinese exclusion were in force in Cuba, something would have been said in the message or by other means of communication to Congress explaining why these provisions were omitted from the treaty.

It is not for me to assail the motives of any official, however high or however low. I know, though, and the country knows, that in the bill which was framed at the last session by command of the President there were provisions carefully worded providing that Cuba should enact laws rigidly excluding Chinese, and

without which the reciprocity it provided for should never go into effect, while the treaty which the President made later and that is now up for adoption omits all reference to such requirements.

Mr. President, I put these facts to the Senate. I have no doubt about the sincerity of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. He does not, however, pretend to speak of his own knowledge. The Insular Department simply gives what the Senator has stated as its opinion, because it has heard nothing to the contrary. I take it that Cuba is not now paying much attention to any of the orders of General Wood, now that it has its own President, its own Congress, and its own executive and judicial departments.

There is nothing in the make-up of the population of Cuba, Mr. President, to exclude Chinese labor. Why are the Chinese excluded from the United States? Not because the New England manufacturers favored such exclusion; not because the manufacturers in any section of the country saw a necessity for it. Their ideal of a manufacturing heaven is cheap raw material and the cheapest labor to be secured, and they would be only too glad to see every exclusion law wiped from the statute books, that competition in labor might become the same as competition in the purchase and sale of hogs. The elements in the United States that secured the Chinese-exclusion law were the laboring elements.

The labor unions, representing the different trades and callings, led in the educational campaigns; and soon the common people living in every section of the country recognized the justice of the propaganda labor was directing. They came to labor's support, and Congress was forced by the sentiment they aroused to place such exclusion laws upon the statute book. Have the Spanish owners of sugar plantations any views except those of profit upon that grave social and industrial question? The labor of Cuba can not be compared in intelligence and vigor and independence with the labor of the United States. American labor will not go to Cuba. Americans who do go there will go there to exploit and get rich quickly. They will be people of wealth and those ambitious for wealth. They will go to exploit. Their force and intelligence and selfishness will so overpower labor that the voice of labor can not be heard to defend itself from the yellow curse. Though there were an exclusion law upon the statute book, it would be as much a dead letter as the statutes against swearing or the city ordinances against expectorating upon the sidewalks.

The farmers of the United States, especially those engaged in the production of the sugar beet, the fruits, and the vegetables with which the products of Cuba come in competition, may as well recognize as an immovable fact that they will have in Cuba the cheapest labor of the world to compete with, and that just as soon as these reciprocal arrangements between the United States and Cuba are perfected, when everything is settled to the notion of the American sugar trust, then, Mr. President, you will see the influx of Chinese and Japanese labor into Cuba commence in earnest, and what is predicted now will then become an accomplished fact.

Mr. President, when we view the attempted legislation in Congress there appears to be a settled and determined effort through some agency, of which the Republican leaders of the Senate and House appear to be the mouthpiece, to destroy the beet-sugar industry of the country and to supplant it with the product of the cane. We know that beet sugar is a menace to the profits of the sugar trust. We know that beet sugar leaves the factory in the refined state; that crude beet sugar is unfit for domestic or manufacturing use; that it is offensive to the smell and odious to the taste.

So beet sugar must be refined before the maker of it can find a market. For every ton of beet sugar consumed in the United States there is wrested from the sugar trust the profits on a ton of raw cane sugar produced in Cuba or the Philippines or elsewhere, upon which it not only loses the profit of refining, but since the trust in connection with the Hamburg dealers are able to fix the price of refined cane sugar it loses the artificial profit upon it. Therefore, Mr. President, when we find the sugar trust invading Michigan and closing the mouths of Michigan representatives, when we find the sugar trust invading Colorado and buying up stock in the beet-sugar companies, we realize that it is not for the welfare of the beet-sugar industry, but for the purpose of controlling as far as it can the production of beet sugar, that it may carry on with more certainty of success the scheme on foot to limit as much as possible, if not destroy, the beet-sugar industry altogether. Its design is to maintain for the future, as they have today, practically an absolute control over the sugar supply for the United States.

Mr. President, in struggling against the reduction of the tariff on Cuban sugar, I do not understand that I am offending any Democratic doctrine. I stand, as I have heard others say they stand, ready to unite with the rest of Congress in any general and

fair revision of the tariff, and am ready, when that is done, to submit to such reduction in sugar duties as justice will require. I maintain that when the tariff is reduced upon sugar the tariff should be reduced upon every article that the sugar raiser needs and purchases. When he can, through such reduction, buy his agricultural implements, his lumber, his nails, his clothing, and everything that enters into his family and industrial life at the lesser price that the reduction of the tariff will bring about, he can then afford an equitable reduction in sugar rates. The sugar schedule was fixed at the time schedules upon every other line of American products were fixed. They were systematically and, I suppose, scientifically arranged. They should stand as they were fixed or be revised and modified together. To select one schedule for immolation is unfair to the producer of the goods in that schedule, and I protest against it.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. PATTERSON. Certainly.

Mr. ALDRICH. Does the Senator think that a rate which will be equitable between nails and sugar—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is out of order.

Mr. ALDRICH. I will address the Chair. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator must get permission from the Chair—

Mr. ALDRICH. I addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. And of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. PATTERSON. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. ALDRICH. I was about to ask the Senator from Colorado if he thought the establishment of equitable rates of that kind upon nails, upon sugar, and upon each of the other articles that he has named would be a proper thing to do; and would he be willing that sugar should receive the same ad valorem rate that these other articles receive? Would he think that was proper protection?

Mr. PATTERSON. I am ready, Mr. President, taking the present tariff schedules as the basis, to stand for a fair and equitable reduction of rates all along the line.

Mr. ALDRICH. Why does the Senator take the present tariff as the basis? Does he think that is equitable?

Mr. PATTERSON. No, sir; of course it is not equitable; and I have very, very grave question as to whether the Senator from Rhode Island believes it to be equitable.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think it is too high—

Mr. PATTERSON. I think it is too high. I am very glad we have that deliberate admission from the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. ALDRICH. I beg the Senator's pardon. When I was interrupted by the Chair I was about to say—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is out of order.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. PATTERSON. Certainly, Mr. President.

Mr. ALDRICH. I was about saying when I was interrupted that I think the present rates upon sugar are higher, in view of all the circumstances, than they ought to be, and I believe the Senator from Colorado agrees with me; but he is willing to have the duties reduced, as I understand him now, upon other articles, but is not willing to have them reduced upon sugar.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. President, how the Senator from Rhode Island can reach a conclusion such as that, in view of my statement, I am at a loss to determine. With one proposition I do not agree—and if I had the time I could demonstrate it—that the tariff is too high upon sugar; that with the tariff as it exists to-day beet sugar, taking an entire season's crop as the basis, is almost a losing proposition. The margin of profit for the beet-sugar raiser is so small that if the tariff upon Cuban sugar is reduced as the pending bill proposes you will find the production of the sugar beet very largely curtailed and the progress of the industry arrested.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. ALDRICH. Does the Senator mean to enunciate as a doctrine for himself and his party that the possibility of producing at a profit articles in the United States is the sole element to be taken into consideration in fixing duties? Is that the contention of the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. President, I will answer the Senator from Rhode Island and answer some of my Democratic colleagues by quoting the words of Thomas Jefferson. I say now, I am willing to stand by what that great apostle of Democracy said about American industries; and I insist that the true Democratic doctrine, measured by Jefferson's teachings, is that where an article of moment may be produced in this country, if it needs protection in its infant state, the tariff should be high enough to afford that protection from the destructive competition of the cheaper foreign article until, if it can be accomplished within a reasonable time, it is able to hold its own in the American market.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes, sir; I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. ALDRICH. Is that Democratic doctrine? Is that doctrine sustained by the Senator's associates on that side of the Chamber?

Mr. PATTERSON. I propose to read what Thomas Jefferson said.

Mr. SPOONER. What does the Senator from Colorado say?

Mr. PATTERSON. I approve what Mr. Jefferson said, and I add, Mr. President, that when you can demonstrate that an article such as beet sugar is capable of the tremendous production to which that article can be brought within certain portions of the United States, when, with reasonable protection, there can be raised within this country every pound of sugar that will be consumed within it, and thus save to the country and retain in the pockets of its people \$100,000,000 annually, and more, that would otherwise go to enrich foreign countries, if protection is to be the rule, that product is entitled to sufficient protection.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. PATTERSON. Certainly.

Mr. ALDRICH. Does the Senator think that the rule he has enunciated in regard to beet sugar ought to apply to the other products of the United States?

Mr. PATTERSON. When you name a product upon a parity with beet sugar, capable of such tremendous expansion, capable of resulting in such revenues to the farmer, an article of prime necessity, capable of retaining in this country within the course of a few years the immense sum of a hundred million dollars and over, then I have no hesitation in saying, if protection is to be the rule, that article, if it needs it, is entitled to protection.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. PATTERSON. Certainly, Mr. President.

Mr. ALDRICH. Does the Senator think there is any other product in the United States that comes within the rule which he has named except beet sugar?

Mr. PATTERSON. Oh, yes, Mr. President. It may be that the things the Senator has in mind and that I have in mind may be produced in such quantities and at such figures by reason of our vast area, the productiveness of our soil, and the ease with which they are cultivated and gathered that they will get along and have gotten along for nearly a century without any protection. The status of each article is what determines its claim upon Congress in the matter of duties.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] would not insist, nor will any of his colleagues, that every article that may be produced within the United States is to be succored by the same percentage of protection. It may be a relatively small duty for one, a higher duty for another, and a yet higher duty for another. The things to be taken into consideration, as I understand, are: Is it a product of which this country may be made the home? Is it a useful article, and may it be supplied to American consumers at a profit with reasonable protection?

If I have not read the literature of my Republican friends in vain, then I am right in what I have suggested, however crudely I may have explained it. But for the information of my Republican friends and some of my Democratic friends let me read what Thomas Jefferson said. In a letter to David Humphreys, found in Ford's edition of his works, Volume V, page 416, this is the doctrine he announced:

My idea is that we should encourage home manufactures to the extent of our own consumption of everything of which we raise the raw material.

In his second annual message Mr. Jefferson said:

To protect the manufactures adapted to our circumstances * * * (is one of) the landmarks by which we are to guide ourselves in all our proceedings.

In his eighth annual message he said:

Little doubt remains that the (manufacturing) establishments formed and forming will, under the auspices of cheaper materials and subsistence, the freedom of labor from taxation with us, and of protecting duties and prohibitions, become permanent.

Again, speaking of infant industries—and the sugar beet in the United States, however vigorous an infant it may be, is an infant that has the sunshine of but six or seven years upon its head—Mr. Jefferson said:

I do not mean to say that it may not be for the general interest to foster for a while certain infant manufactures until they are strong enough to stand against foreign rivals.

That is what we say about beet sugar. It is an infant industry, and it ought to be fostered until it is strong enough to stand against foreign rivals. It is not an industry that is hoary headed, that has grown so strong that it not only supplies the American demand but is able to enter free-trade countries across the ocean and successfully compete with the products of those lands.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. ALDRICH. I wish the Senator from Colorado would tell me frankly whether he thinks Mr. Jefferson's doctrines are liable to be indorsed by the Democratic caucus in these modern times?

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. President, the Democratic party is not a free-trade party. Ask a Democratic Senator to-day, and I doubt if you will find one who says he is in favor of free trade. There have been times when tariff for revenue only was a cult, and, as was said by the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] yesterday, when free raw material was a cult, but conditions have changed the views of many. There was a time when a vast section of this country was almost wholly agricultural, with little prospect in the future of becoming manufacturing, and it appeared to be to the interest of those sections, "intelligent selfishness," as it has been denominated, that they should struggle for free trade, because their desire and interest were to secure everything they consumed at the lowest price at which it could be obtained.

I discover, Mr. President, that now in the State of Georgia, in North Carolina, in the State of Maryland, and in other Democratic States tariff views have changed considerably. Their people now stand for a revenue sufficient to meet the necessities of the Government, economically administered, with all the protection that is incidental to such a revenue; and I am willing to stand upon that proposition.

There is a wide difference between a tariff that will raise the revenue for a government economically administered, with incidental protection, and a tariff that offers a refuge to every trust and monopoly that can break its way into the country. There is a wide difference between the tariff for which I stand, and for which my Democratic colleagues stand, and the one which enables the American manufacturer to send abroad what he makes and sell it to the foreigner at anywhere from 30 to 50 per cent less than he sells it to the American customer. There is a wide difference between a tariff which provides revenue for a government economically administered, with incidental protection, and one that may be so manipulated that all the steel and iron and leather and cotton products of this country can be practically placed under the control of one head that possesses the power to raise prices until the profits make the monopolists multimillionaires—every one of them—almost within a year.

I wish to read from a letter written by Mr. Jefferson to Thomas Lieper. He says:

Every syllable uttered in my name becomes a text for the Federalists, who torment the public mind by their paraphrases and perversions. I have lately inculcated the encouragement of manufactures to the extent of our own consumption, at least, in all articles of which we raise the raw material.

Is there any article consumed in the United States of which more of American raw material enters than into beet sugar? From the time the seed is planted in the ground until the product as sugar is emptied into the sack at the sugar mill everything associated with the industry is American. The labor is American, the soil is American, the sun is American, the machinery is American, the limestone, the coal, the coke, the sulphur, the barrels, the sacks are all American. There is no finished article the product of American intelligence, labor, and skill that is so distinctively American as is beet sugar when ready to be placed upon the market.

But I continue to read from Mr. Jefferson's letter to Mr. Lieper:

I have lately inculcated the encouragement of manufactures to the extent of our own consumption, at least, in all articles of which we raise the raw material. On this the Federal papers and meetings have sounded the alarm of Chinese policy, destruction of commerce, etc. That is to say, the iron which we make must not be wrought here into plows, axes, hose, etc., in order that the shipowner may have the profit of carrying it to Europe and bringing it back in a manufactured form, as if after manufacturing our own raw materials for our own use there would not be a surplus produce sufficient to employ a due proportion of navigation in carrying it to market and exchanging it for those articles of which we have not the raw material.

Yet this absurd hue and cry has contributed much to federalize New England. Their doctrine goes to the sacrificing agriculture and manufactures to commerce, to the calling off our people from the interior country to the seashore to turn merchants, and to convert this great agricultural country into a city of Amsterdam. But I trust the good sense of our country will see that its greatest prosperity depends on a due balance between agriculture,

manufactures, and commerce, and not in this protuberant navigation which has kept us in hot water from the commencement of our Government and is now engaging us in war.

Mr. President, I am quite willing to stand by every sentence of what I have quoted. He who reads the works of Mr. Jefferson intelligently will discover that what I have read is a fair epitome of the views he expressed upon the subject of protection to American industries.

There is another matter, now that I am on my feet, to which I desire to call the attention of the Senate. It is the loss of the sugar and tobacco duties to the Government. It is admitted that by this measure some \$10,000,000 of the present revenues will be lost. If what the President in his last annual message says is true, if the figures as supplied by the Committee on Appropriations are true, then I give the Senate warning that before the close of the next biennial period the Government will need the revenue that it is proposed to remit by this bill, and the Government will be forced to make good the deficiency by curtailing proper expenditures—it may be for the Navy; it may be for the Agricultural Department; it may be elsewhere—or else the Government will be compelled to impose additional taxes upon other commodities. In his annual message, read in this Chamber a few days ago, the President said, after giving figures which show a continuous and accelerated decrease in the public revenues:

Should this decrease continue at the same ratio throughout the fiscal year, the surplus would be reduced by, approximately, \$30,000,000. Should the revenue from customs suffer much further decrease during the fiscal year, the surplus would vanish.

Then he says:

Such being the case it is of great moment both to exercise care and economy in appropriations and to scan sharply any change in our fiscal revenue system which may reduce our income. The need of strict economy in our expenditures is emphasized by the fact that we can not afford to be parsimonious in providing for what is essential to our national well-being. Careful economy wherever possible will alone prevent our income from falling below the point required in order to meet our genuine needs.

Mr. President, some documents were distributed, as I understand, by the Committee on Appropriations but a few days ago. They are evidently authentic, and I desire to call the attention of the members of that committee to what they disclose.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. PATTERSON. Certainly.

Mr. ALDRICH. Before the Senator leaves the branch of the subject in which I am interested, I should like to read for the information of the Senator a very short extract from a speech recently made elsewhere, in a place to which I am not permitted to allude here, but so interesting and so much to the point that I am sure the Senator from Colorado will be anxious to hear it.

Mr. CARMACK. Where does the Senator from Rhode Island say the speech was made?

Mr. ALDRICH. It was made elsewhere. I quote:

Protection, Mr. Chairman, is a system of taxation whereby many are robbed in order that a few men may be hothoused by legislation into artificial prosperity. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] As a supplementary definition, protection is a system of taxation whereby capital and labor are deflected from naturally profitable pursuits and enterprises into the channels of naturally unprofitable pursuits and enterprises. [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.] And, as a corollary, the method whereby they are deflected is by the enactment of laws forcing the consumer to pay to the artificial hothoused enterprises a higher price than with a free commerce the consumer would have to pay.

Now, this speech, I understand, was the announcement of the doctrines and policy of the new Democracy. It was made by the selected representative of that new Democracy. It was the initial announcement of the Presidential campaign. In justice, however, to the Senator from Colorado, I am bound to say that it was made before the elucidation of these important questions and principles made this day by him, and I suppose that the speaker quoted did not understand what Mr. Jefferson's views were upon this subject. He certainly was not in line with the interpretation of Mr. Jefferson which has been offered by the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. PATTERSON. Will the Senator from Rhode Island tell us who made that speech and where it was made?

Mr. ALDRICH. I am not permitted to do so by the rules of the Senate. It was made in another place.

Mr. PATTERSON. Then, Mr. President, I submit that he ought not to bring into this controversy anonymous communications. When a man is prohibited by any known rule from giving either the author of that from which he quotes or the place, he ought, in common fairness—I was going to say decency, but that is too harsh a word—keep his mouth closed.

Mr. ALDRICH. I will say that he is a representative, the most conspicuous—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This conversation is out of order.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, I will say that the gentleman to whom I have referred is the most conspicuous representative of modern Democracy.

Mr. CARMACK. Oh, no.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think so.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. President—

Mr. ALDRICH. I think I am justified in making the statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is out of order.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, I was recognized by the Chair. The Senator was interrupting me, if there was any interruption. I beg the Chair's pardon—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator can speak on, but he is out of order.

Mr. ALDRICH. I shall take my seat.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. President, I have great respect for the views of the Senator from Rhode Island upon questions of finance or the tariff. He always expresses himself intelligently. But when it comes to his views about who is or is not the most distinguished exponent of modern Democracy I must beg leave to decline to accept his views. There is nothing in the relations of the Senator with distinguished Democrats to justify him in discriminating between their standing. But there are differences between Democrats as there are differences between Republicans. Does the Senator from Rhode Island square his tariff views with the views of the governor of Iowa?

Mr. ALDRICH. I try to.

Mr. PATTERSON. You find that you make a lamentable failure. If current history speaks the truth, and the Senator from Iowa may be able to give us some light upon the subject, the governor of Iowa traveled from Iowa and had an interview at the White House and then went home and permitted the Senator from Iowa to write the platform, materially modifying that which the governor had written in the past.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. PATTERSON. I wish to say that I did not have the junior Senator from Iowa in my eye, but I am quite willing that he shall answer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. PATTERSON. Certainly.

Mr. DOLLIVER. As this is the second time that distinguished Senators have alluded to the governor of Iowa as having altered his convictions and views upon the tariff question, I feel at liberty to say that I know of nothing in his record which indicates that he has surrendered any of his convictions, and the returns of the late election indicate that he surrendered none of his majority.

Mr. PATTERSON. The returns of the late election disclose that the modification of his views, as expressed in the Iowa platform, said to have been prepared by the senior Senator from Iowa, received the approval of the voters of Iowa and not the platform of a year or two years ago, which were distinctively his or the oft-repeated public declarations of the governor of Iowa upon the subject of the tariff.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. PATTERSON. Certainly.

Mr. DOLLIVER. If it will not disturb the Senator—

Mr. PATTERSON. Not at all.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I will add that it is a common opinion in Iowa that as between the two platforms there was no substantial or debatable difference.

Mr. PATTERSON. There was seemingly a difference, but not a substantial difference. There was simply a difference; such a difference as the senior Senator from Iowa knows so well how to promulgate. It was sufficiently different, however, to bring the clashing Republican tariff forces of Iowa together upon a platform, I imagine the junior Senator and the senior Senator yielding some of their views and the governor of Iowa yielding some of his.

I simply refer to this to show that there are differences upon the tariff question between Republicans as well as between Democrats. No machine can make a Procrustean bed and put a Democrat or a Republican upon it to chop off his extremities to fit the measure. There are differences, and there should be differences, but after all there is a happy mean in Democratic views which, when all are considered, amount to about the conclusions I have stated.

But on the Republican side what do we find? The protective tariff leagues all over this country are bombarding and berating Republican Senators for abandoning protection by reason of their support of this measure. And I am inclined to believe that about four out of five of the Republican Senators upon this floor will hold their noses while voting for it. They do not believe in it, and know it is distinctly against the Republican doctrine of protection and that its unerring tendency will be to destroy a great American home industry.

I am sometimes reminded, when I witness the avidity with which my Republican friends swallow whatever comes from the White House, of a nest of young robins, with mouths extended, fluttering their immature wings, ready to receive any worm, though it is a reciprocity worm, that is dropped from the parent bird at the White House. I suppose that that is party discipline. It may be that Senators have concluded that that is what is to pull them through the coming campaign. But it will be a good deal like the nostrum which was warranted to cure anything from a broken leg to a case of unrequited affection. The propounder of the nostrum advertised it and asked for testimonials. One enthusiastic fellow wrote a letter to this effect:

DEAR SIR: My mother-in-law was stricken for nearly a year. For thirty days she lay at death's door. She took one bottle of your wonderful remedy and it pulled her through.

[Laughter.]

Before I recur to the figures to which I was giving attention when interrupted by the Senator from Rhode Island I want to add a few more facts to demonstrate that there is a conspiracy—I do not say any Senator is associated with it—to place the sugar trust in supreme control of all the sugar that is consumed in the United States.

We not only are to have sugar from Cuba under the present bill, but we have the Philippines, which also produce sugar, and with soil equally as well adapted to sugar production as that of Cuba, with a sugar area far in excess of Cuba's area, with legislative propositions to convey vast tracts in the island to syndicates with the view of turning them into sugar plantations.

Here is a bill introduced by the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], which proposes to reduce the present tariff upon sugar the product of the Philippine Islands to 50 per cent of the existing rate. With the tariff reduced on Cuban sugar, with this bill enacted into law, as it will be, if not at the present session, as soon as the election is over, the death knell of American beet sugar is sounded.

We consume somewhere in the neighborhood of 2,600,000 tons. Already the United States, the Hawaiian Islands, Porto Rico, Cuba, and the Philippine Islands produce within 500,000 tons of the total consumption, and when Cuba increases its product from about 1,100,000 tons, which it is now, to 1,500,000 tons the increase in the Philippine Islands certain to follow the adoption of the Lodge bill will more than supply the American demand. When that state is reached, the cheaper sugars of Cuba, the Philippines, Santo Domingo, and the Hawaiian Islands will displace American beet sugar as rapidly as their production is increased. It has become a mere question of time under this new Republican policy when American beet sugar must have its epitaph written.

This is the policy which the Republican party, under the guidance of the President, has entered upon. This is the policy that was commenced in dealing with the Philippine Islands at the last session of Congress, and its extension is now insisted upon by the President and the junior Senator from Massachusetts, the Senator from Ohio, and other leading Administration Senators. I want to say to my Republican friends that if they wish to retain the support of the farmers of the great Northwest it will be well for them to halt, and to halt suddenly. Men do not enjoy seeing the products of their industries destroyed. They will not stand by with indifference while their investments are being undermined for the profit of distant islands and the enrichment of trusts.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. PATTERSON. Certainly.

Mr. ALDRICH. Is not the Senator aware that if this measure becomes a law, as it probably will, it will become so by and with the support of a large majority of the Democratic representatives in both Houses?

Mr. PATTERSON. I am sorry to say, Mr. President, that such will be the case, so far as the House is concerned; but it is not so with the Senate. In the Senate the measure receives very meager Democratic support. I do not know what influence moves Democrats. They must answer to their own convictions and to their own constituencies. I know that their attitude is not a wise one and will not commend them to the farmers of the country. But this is in no sense a Democratic measure. It is the President's measure, and it is he, moved by what influences we must only surmise, who negotiated it and now presses it upon Congress.

Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I believe in a revision of the tariff, but I do not believe in the American sugar trust revising it for me. I stand ready to see many articles placed upon the free list, where they may be so placed without serious impairment to worthy American industries, but I do not propose that the American sugar trust shall point out to me what particular items shall go upon the free list nor upon what particular items the tariff shall be reduced.

If officials high and influential in the Republican party are willing to occupy a different attitude, it is for them to answer. For Democrats who will follow, it is for them to answer. I speak for myself. What I say is the outgrowth of my own mature convictions. I know I represent the views of my constituents, irrespective of party, and I know that there are fifteen or sixteen Republican Senators upon this floor who, if they could break away from the influences of the White House and vote against this measure, as their convictions tell them they should, they would bring rejoicing to the hearthstones of an all but unanimous constituency at home.

To return to the loss of revenue which this measure will entail. The actual appropriations for 1904 were \$728,651,607.12. The total estimates for 1905 are \$783,974,206.19. In other words, the excess of estimates for 1905 over appropriations for 1904 is \$55,322,599.07. It can not be said that Congress will eliminate from the estimates an amount to bring the appropriations within the revenue; for we find that the appropriations for the present year were but \$5,000,000 below the estimates, and when you add to the appropriations about \$20,000,000 of deficiencies and miscellaneous bills you find that the actual appropriations by the last Congress were in excess of the estimates.

The President in his annual message estimated that the revenues from all sources except postal revenues this year would be \$560,396,674. We have not the estimates of revenues for this year from the postal service, but I take the postal revenue for the fiscal year 1903, and it amounted to \$159,472,060.72. If we add the estimate of the President of revenues from all sources except the postal revenue to the postal revenue of the present year—and it is not likely to be increased much next year—we find that the total is \$719,868,734.72, or the full revenue for 1905, adding the postal revenues for last year as the postal revenue for this, and the total revenues will fall below the estimates \$64,105,471.47.

Yet, with this condition staring Congress in the face, with Congress appropriating up to estimates and usually exceeding them by the deficiencies that are voted and added, the proposition is to give to Spanish sugar planters and the American sugar trust ten millions of the current Government revenue.

Mr. President, what is it for? The plea of suffering Cuba has been abandoned. Now, it is all made to rest upon some asserted obligation of honor, and why? The claim is made that by forcing the Platt amendment upon Cuba a moral obligation rests upon the United States to help Cuba through reciprocal tariff relations, even though in aiding Cuba serious injury will result to the American farmer.

I deny it. I deny that anything was forced upon Cuba except that which the United States would force upon it whether the Platt amendment had been adopted or not. I assert that the Platt amendment no more interferes with the independence of Cuba than does the enforcement of the Monroe doctrine as to Mexico, the Central American States, and the South American States. What are the provisions of the Platt amendment? Let me very briefly recur to them. The first prevents Cuba from entering into a treaty with any foreign power which will impair or tend to impair the independence of Cuba, and will not permit any foreign power to obtain by colonization or for military or naval purposes lodgment in or control over any portion of the island. Must not impair the independence of Cuba. That means the subversion of Cuba by some foreign power. It is to prevent the lodgment within the island of Cuba of some foreign power. That is prohibited.

Under a fair construction of the Monroe doctrine, so far as the first section of the Platt amendment is concerned, it simply puts into effect the Monroe doctrine. Cuba accepts it, and why should not Cuba accept it? There is not a South American or a Central American State that is not grateful to the United States for its assertion of the Monroe doctrine. Not one of them that does not feel more secure in the morning and in the evening and in the darkness of midnight by reason of it.

The second clause of the amendment declares that Cuba—

shall not assume or contract any public debt to pay which, etc., the ordinary revenues of the island after paying the current expenses of the Government will be inadequate.

That does not prevent Cuba from enacting laws for the collection of whatever revenue it sees fit. So the indebtedness is within the limits of its revenue as fixed and collected by the Cuban Government, there is no infringement of the second clause. It is simply another safeguard to make the Monroe doctrine the more effective. It is to prevent such governments as Germany, Great Britain, and France, from setting up claims of indebtedness and using those claims as excuses for sailing their ships of war into Cuban harbors, and landing their armies upon Cuban soil, and ultimately securing lodgment for foreign colonies within its limits. It is a fair, just, and considerate extension of the Monroe doctrine, and within the limits of the Monroe doctrine it does

not interfere with the actual indebtedness of Cuba at all. The next is:

The United States may intervene for the preservation of Cuban independence.

The United States does not insist upon any particular form of government in Cuba. So far as the Platt amendment goes Cuba may be a republic or a monarchy. Independence and freedom may exist without a republican form of government. This clause is a simple provision that the United States may see that there is Cuban independence, and—

the maintenance of a government adequate for the protection of life, property, and individual liberty, and for discharging the obligations with respect to Cuba imposed by the treaty of Paris on the United States now to be assumed and undertaken by the Government of Cuba.

Could the United States have done less? By the treaty of Paris the United States undertook for Cuba, then about to become a sovereign government, certain obligations that Cuba in the end was bound to perform and should perform. This latter clause is but a proper provision to secure the performance by Cuba of the obligations that the United States assumed for her under the treaty of Paris.

The next clause validates the acts of the United States in Cuba, "lawful acts," I think is the term, during the American occupancy, and why should it not? Why should not Cuba agree that in recognition of the services of its deliverer from the tyranny and oppression of Spain at the cost of blood and treasure, a deliverance that the Cubans were utterly unable to secure for themselves, it would validate the acts of the United States while we were in possession, providing for the institution of a stable government therein?

Then Cuba assumes obligations to execute plans devised or that might after be mutually agreed upon for the sanitation of the seacoast cities. There is no proposition to interfere in that. It is a moral obligation resting upon Cuba to prosecute the sanitary reforms that were inaugurated while the island was in the possession of the United States, and for very plain and palpable reasons.

Then the Isle of Pines was to be omitted from the constitutional boundaries of Cuba. I understand that even the Senators who constituted the Commission upon the part of the United States agree that under the terms of the treaty the Isle of Pines does not belong to Cuba. The United States proposed in the Platt amendment that Cuba for that reason should omit it in declaring its boundaries; and what is the United States doing? Out of the abundance of its generosity, because the Isle of Pines is close to and may be of advantage to Cuba, the United States generously gives it to Cuba by a treaty that has not yet been acted upon, but which I suppose will be ultimately ratified.

The only exaction that the Platt amendment puts upon Cuba that is not legitimately within the reason of the Monroe doctrine is that it will cede or lease coaling stations to the United States.

Well, Mr. President, I think that more has been paid for these coaling stations than was ever paid by one government to another before for such uses. It is not unusual for governments to negotiate with one another for the purchase and sale of coaling stations. The price that we paid for these in Cuba can never be estimated in dollars and cents. It can hardly be estimated in suffering and in deaths. It can hardly be estimated in the pension lists that will follow as the result of the war for the liberation of that island.

Tell me that by reason of the provisions of the Platt amendment there is an obligation, moral or otherwise, resting upon the United States to concede to Cuba except what we would concede to any other country as a free gift without moral or other coercion! Mr. President, the claim of moral obligation is not an honest one. No man who has in mind the price that this Government paid for the freedom of Cuba—the price in money and blood and lives and pension lists and woe and travail—can believe for a moment that there is any moral claim which calls upon the United States to concede to Cuba beyond that which the Government should concede to any other nation that deals fairly and justly by it.

Mr. President, I have occupied much more time than I intended. The question of the industry to which I have especially directed my attention is with me an important one, an overpowering one. I have seen the investments of the millions of dollars that the people of the Northwest and of my State have made in this industry. I have seen in Colorado alone, where six years ago not a pound of sugar was produced, this year 100,000 tons added to the world's supply.

Colorado is the third beet-sugar producing State of the country. California and Michigan alone exceed Colorado in sugar production. I would be false to every obligation that rests upon a Representative were I to sit idly and silently by while legislation was being enacted that Congress itself does not desire, that is forced upon an unwilling Congress by an overzealous President, and that Senators can not sustain under any plea of right or justice.

The time will come, Mr. President, when what I have predicted about the injury to the great American sugar industry will be justified in every letter, syllable, word, and line. The time will soon come when the Philippine measure will be added to this Cuban outrage, and when it does come the American sugar industry will soon thereafter lie in its grave, the money that has been invested in it will be lost, and the sufferers will be those whom the Republicans have insisted should look to them for protection.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President—

Mr. CULLOM. Will the Senator from Wisconsin allow me to make a request of the Senate?

Mr. SPOONER. Certainly.

Mr. CULLOM. I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the votes upon the Cuban treaty and the amendments thereto.

Mr. HOAR. That ought to be done, I suppose, in executive session.

Mr. CULLOM. I do not see any reason why it should.

Mr. HOAR. I do. So I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made.

Mr. CULLOM. If objection is made, I will let it go.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, I desire to address the Senate briefly upon some phases of this subject. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] desires to proceed this evening. I will take the floor, if it is agreeable to the Senate, and yield to the Senator from Colorado for such remarks as he wants to make. I shall not take long.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I do not intend to make a speech, but the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] seemed to be very anxious to know whether the friends of beet sugar were asking some special privilege for it. There has been no speech made here or anywhere else which indicated that the opponents of this bill and the advocates of "standing pat" on this particular duty have ever thought or suggested that this was an industry they wanted special legislation for.

If there is anything that the Republican party has in its lifetime iterated and reiterated, it is that the protective system was for infant industries. It is that enterprises first starting might be built up by the tariff. That has been one of the things the Democrats have frequently complained of, and said it was not the province of the Government to foster any enterprise or industry. But it does not lie in the mouth of any man who belongs to the Republican party to complain when we say that this is an infant industry and falls within the rule that you have laid down and upon which the country has proceeded for the greater part of the time at least for the last forty years.

Now, Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator from Rhode Island that we ask no special favors for this Colorado and western industry. We simply ask that you shall treat that industry as you treat any other. But we do stand here and protest against the infamy of this great Government saying to an enterprise that is certainly reputable and respectable, "We will withdraw from you one-fifth of the protection granted to other enterprises." If you stopped there, if you withdrew that from all the sugar which comes into the United States, we might not have a just complaint. But you do not do that. You keep up the tariff on every other pound of sugar that comes in except that which comes from Cuba. You say that will reduce to the Cuban planter on the duty now paid about 34 cents on a hundred pounds of sugar, and that will go into his pocket. There is not anybody here so stupid nor is there anybody in my State so stupid who does not know that that is a bounty which you are paying the competitor of the Colorado beet-sugar raiser.

Mr. President, you might as well face that, and you have got to face it. You can not excuse it; you can not palliate it. You have got where you can not even claim that there is any occasion to build up the sugar industry in Cuba. It will take care of itself, and you know it.

Mr. President, there is but one conclusion that any man of logical mind can come to, and that is, if you believe, as you say you do, that the Cuban is to get the benefit of the reduction, you mean to destroy the beet-sugar industry in this country. As my colleague has said, you have another bill here, and when that shall have become a law you will have another bill; and so you will go on and destroy that industry.

I do not know whether it is because of its geography; I do not know whether it is because in this great industry the West is to come to the front and practically produce the sugar; but I do know, Mr. President, that in the many years I have been associated with this question it has never been the policy of the Republican party, or of any other party, to pick out an industry in one section of the country and ruin it. And that is what you propose to do in this case. You propose to do it without any excuse whatever. You propose to give to the people of Cuba, you say, not \$6,000,000 a year, as has been said, but more than \$6,000,000 on

sugar alone; and then you make them a present of about \$4,000,000 a year on the tobacco that they will bring to the United States.

Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM], the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, said that this year the reduction of duty would amount to \$10,000,000. He intimated that next year it would not be quite that large. I venture to say that next year it will be somewhat greater than it will be this year, because the sugar production in Cuba will be much above what it is this year, and the Cubans will sell us more sugar next year than they sell us this year.

It is true that we get a concession. It is true that we get something in return in the way of a remission of duties. We remit \$10,000,000 of duties and put \$10,000,000 of burdens in addition to what would have been put upon our people if those duties had been paid by Cuba, and we get the magnificent sum of \$1,100,000 as a concession or rebate, you may say, of Cuban duties. It is a concession of \$10,000,000 on our part and of \$1,000,000 on the part of the Cubans.

Mr. SPOONER. Will the Senator from Colorado yield to me for a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. SPOONER. I merely wish to ask the Senator a question for information.

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. SPOONER. It is not to provoke debate or controversy. Does the Senator agree with his colleague that the present duty on sugar is not more than adequate for protection to the beet-sugar industry?

Mr. TELLER. I am not called upon to pass upon that question.

Mr. SPOONER. I only wanted the Senator's opinion. I do not know myself.

Mr. TELLER. I want to say that the duty was put upon it by the party in power at the time it was enacted, which is the party in power now. If it is the opinion of the party in power that it is higher than it ought to be, then they have the unquestionable right and the unquestionable power to reduce it to a degree which they think is equitable and just.

I have said again and again that when you attempt a revision of the tariff I will join in any reasonable revision of it; but I shall not, without a protest, allow you to take the duty off practically the only thing in my State which is protected by the tariff.

Mr. PATTERSON. Will my colleague yield to me for a moment?

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. PATTERSON. Apropos of the question propounded by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER], I want to state that the Agricultural Department, in a very full exposition of the beet-sugar industry, taking the entire product of the last year, demonstrates that beet sugar when ready for the market costs 4 cents and a fraction a pound.

Mr. ALDRICH. Where?

Mr. PATTERSON. Here in the United States. When ready for shipment, the Department says, it costs 4 cents and a fraction a pound. If there is any controversy about it, I shall have the figures here to-morrow to demonstrate what I say.

Now, then, when you take the cost of making Cuban sugar and add to it the tariff, it is perfectly demonstrable and clear beyond peradventure that the present tariff duty on beet sugar is not sufficient. That is the truth about it. The Louisiana cane-sugar planter lost on his crop last year and there was the merest fraction of a cent a pound made upon the beet-sugar crop of last year. I will demonstrate it if there is any question made about it.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to ask the junior Senator from Colorado a question, if I may, on this point. What per cent ad valorem would he consider to be a reasonable protection for beet sugar?

Mr. PATTERSON. I have not figured it out, and have not attempted to do so. I have demonstrated to my own satisfaction that the present rate of duty is not at all excessive, and that you can not afford to deduct any fraction of protection from it.

Mr. HOAR. What does the Senator consider the ad valorem of the present rate of duty? I mean in round numbers, of course.

Mr. PATTERSON. I do not understand the Senator's question.

Mr. HOAR. What does the present rate of duty afford ad valorem as a protection, according to the Senator's understanding?

Mr. PATTERSON. I suppose that depends upon the price of sugar.

Mr. HOAR. Of course.

Mr. PATTERSON. If I am not mistaken, I think it is somewhere between 70 and 80 per cent. I am not clear about it. I am giving the Senator my best recollection, yet I may be mistaken, for I have not carried the figures out in detail.

Mr. HOAR. I am not very learned or wise on this particular question, and while I shall, of course, support this bill, I am not myself very enthusiastic about it. Yet I have put the question

to several leading sugar advocates within the last twelve months, and everyone who has been to see me or communicated with me—and a good many have—and I have received from no one of them an answer which indicated that he thought there ought to be a duty which should be higher than an average of 60 per cent ad valorem. That is what they have substantially agreed on.

Mr. TELLER. Who has agreed on that?

Mr. HOAR. I can not give the names. I would not, of course, if I could, and I could not if I would; but everybody who has made a communication to me on this subject has made the statement that the duty should not be higher than 60 per cent ad valorem. The question is whether, so far as this particular part of this thing is concerned—the junior Senator from Colorado talks about destroying this infant industry and this legislation being the grave of the beet-sugar industry—60 per cent ad valorem is not a good living protection for beet sugar?

Mr. PATTERSON. I simply want to suggest to the Senator—

Mr. HOAR. I do not understand the Senator himself, although he is a representative of this great industry in his State, which we all respect, has any information which prepares him to say what would be a proper protection.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. President, I have never made any efforts to reduce it to the ad valorem.

Mr. ALLISON. Will the Senator allow me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. ALLISON. The ad valorem for the present year on raw sugar is 97, and on refined sugar 101.

Mr. PATTERSON. I have never attempted to reduce it to the ad valorem basis, but there is one thing we know, I would say in reply to the Senator from Massachusetts: We know what it costs to produce beet sugar, so far as we can learn it from the careful investigation and the truthful report of the Department of Agriculture. We know approximately to-day what Cuban sugar can be produced for, we know what it can be sold for if you plus its cost of production with the tariff, and we know that, with that as the basis and the guide, the sugar industry of the United States is languishing to-day in Louisiana and in the beet-sugar States, and that you can not afford to reduce the duty, however it may figure out ad valorem, without seriously injuring that industry.

Mr. HOAR. If I may ask the Senator a question, is it languishing—

Mr. TELLER. I think, Mr. President, I must resume the floor.

Mr. HOAR. I will finish the sentence, with the Senator's leave. If the sugar industry be languishing, is it languishing in consequence of Cuban competition?

Mr. PATTERSON. Certainly; and Porto Rico and the Philippines will add their quota. All you have got to do is to take down the bars and the industry is gone. That is exactly what we are fighting against. We are fighting against Cuban competition, and against making the effort to produce sugar in this country more difficult.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, it is not a question whether the sugar duty is too high as compared with other duties. The question is whether you should revise the tariff and reduce the tariff on one single article when the demand, if there is any demand at all, is that all articles included in the tariff should be considered.

I do not myself believe, and I think I know perhaps as much about the matter as anybody who is not engaged in the sugar industry, that the present tariff is too high for the protection of the infant industry of beet sugar. I am not one of those at whom the Senators on the other side can throw clubs. I have been voting a good many years here with them on the tariff question.

I thought it was a Republican principle, and I thought it ought to be a Democratic principle, that any infant industry is entitled to the care of the Government. I know that theorists have said otherwise, and I know that there was a time when the Democratic party, as a party, insisted that the Government should be bloodless and heartless and heedless of any interest. But, Mr. President, that has not been the policy of this Government. You have taken care of the New England factories; you have taken care of every industry on the Pacific coast; and when there is an attempt to meet a great and growing want in this country by raising our own sugar, thus saving to our people from \$100,000,000 to \$125,000,000 a year which we have sent out of the country for many years for foreign sugar, that attempt should not be resisted.

Mr. President, the raising of beet sugar is one of the infant industries in this country. I know there are more sugar factories in Michigan than there are in Colorado.

I do not wish to make any statement that will hurt any industry, but I know that there has been more than one beet-sugar factory in this country which has been on the very verge of bankruptcy even under the present tariff. That industry is young, Mr. President. Every little while the manufacturer of beet sugar

finds that there is another method which perhaps would be better than the one he employs; and at great expense he changes his machinery. That industry is going through the same experience which every other infant industry has undergone since the world began. It is being brought to perfection by degrees. The time will come when beet sugar can be made for 3 cents a pound; but it can not be made at any such price now, nor can it be made and sold for 4 cents a pound; and yet I look forward to the day when it will be profitable to sell beet sugar from the factories at even 3 cents a pound.

What is the theory upon which you have been legislating for many years? I have voted with you on every tariff bill passed here for twenty-five years or more, except in one instance. Your theory is that an infant industry is entitled to the protecting care of this Government. If there is anything that you have boasted of since you were organized as a political party, it is that.

Mr. President, whether it is right or whether it is wrong, whether we can submit to a reduction or whether we can not, that is not the way to revise the American tariff. To pick out a single item and reduce the duty on that item is not the way to revise the tariff. If we should find that a tariff duty was too high and that it brought about hardships upon the people of the country by putting too high a price upon the article, then there might be some reason for reducing the tariff on that article.

Nobody has declared here that sugar is to be made cheaper as a result of the passage of this bill. On the contrary, it has been declared over and over again that the same price is to be paid by the American consumer under this tariff, modified as you are modifying it, as has been paid under the existing tariff.

You say Cuba, struggling Cuba, needs our fostering care. Some on this side of the Chamber within my recollection, who have inveighed against the protecting hand of the Government being extended to any industry, are telling us that they think the particular industry in their section needs the protecting care of the Government to-day, but seem to be willing to take it off of this one article, beet sugar, whose production is practically confined to the great plains of the West.

Mr. SPOONER. That is practically what General Hancock said.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, there was a very distinguished gentleman who ran for the Presidency—he was distinguished as a warrior, though not so much so perhaps as a statesman—who said one day that the tariff question was a local question, and there went up a guffaw all over the country as if he were making an ignoramus of himself. In the twenty-five years and more that I have been here I have found that the tariff question is an absolutely local question. I have found that New England stands for a tariff on its cotton goods to an extent away beyond this in amount. I never found any of them complaining that the tariff was too high. If the tariff on cotton goods is not high enough, there is nobody who has had more to do with the fixing of that tariff for the manufacturers of New England than the chairman of the Committee on Finance of this Senate [Mr. ALDRICH]. If that duty is not high enough to protect New England and New England industries, he, and he alone, is to blame.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] would seem to indicate that he thinks the tariff duty on sugar is too high. I did not intend to touch on that question, but I want to say just a word or two. When the House committee were taking evidence a year ago last winter, I note they brought before it a gentleman from the city of Baltimore who, with his associates, had invested about \$2,000,000 in the sugar industry in Colorado. They had bought a large tract of land; they had built a factory to make sugar, and they had constructed ditches. In all my experience, Mr. President, I have never seen a better illustration of the benefits of a protective-tariff system than I saw in that instance. They selected for their operations a prairie without an inhabitant on it—growing nothing but wild grass. They dug a ditch many miles in length and at great expense; then they built a factory, and to-day there are at least 2,500 or 3,000 intelligent American citizens who get their living by raising beets on that piece of land and making sugar in that factory. They took a raw prairie and in two years they had a town on it of 2,000 people. They had churches and schools and all the institutions of civilized life.

A gentleman connected with the beet-sugar industry—not a Democrat, but a Maryland Republican—appeared before the House committee and in substance stated that this reduction of one-fifth of the duty on sugar would put that great enterprise into the scrap heap, using that very term. I did not bring the report of the testimony taken by that committee here for the purpose of reading from it, and perhaps I may not have discovered the best things that this gentleman from Baltimore, Mr. Carey, said.

Mr. CAREY. Raw sugar went up yesterday. I expect refined sugar has gone up, too. The last report I had was \$4.48 per 100 pounds f. o. b. Kansas City. That is the market in which I am chiefly interested.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Now, can the producers of sugar in this country escape loss at that price?

Mr. CAREY: I can not answer that question except as a guess. My opinion is that, so far as the Michigan factories are concerned, until they find a more profitable use for their by-products, \$4.25 would put them out of the ring. That means practically 4-cent sugar at the factory, allowing from 10 to 20 cents to freight it. Of course you add to the expenses if you have to store your sugar and pay interest and storage charges on it. This will be a necessity if the trust continues to hold up our market at the manufacturing period.

Mr. NEWLANDS: Would 4½ cents be a compensatory price?

Mr. CAREY: I think 4½ cents—from 4½ to 4½ cents—is not far from the permanent price of sugar to-day.

That was a year ago last January. I believe the sugar factories of Colorado can produce sugar more cheaply than it can be produced in any other portion of the world. We have invested in Colorado up to the present time not less than \$6,000,000, largely our own money. All of the seven or eight factories have been prosperous except one. I do not like to say anything about the beet-sugar industry of any other State for fear I may be charged with making a comparison between my own State and another, but I do not know of another State in which the sugar industry has been so largely developed and in which sugar factories are more numerous than they are in Colorado, where a number of factories have not been in distress. I only know one in Colorado that has had any special trouble.

We produce in Colorado beets much richer than those found—I ought not to say in Colorado alone, because the same richness of quality is found in the beets of all that arid or semiarid region, Utah, Wyoming, Montana, and so on, in what might be called the irrigating region—we produce there beets that are very much richer than can be raised in regions where rain is common. One trouble in raising beets for sugar is that if you have a rainy fall the beet continues to grow and the sugar is not deposited in the beet. In Colorado we rarely have a rainy fall. Any Senator who will take the pains to walk into the Marble Room and look at the map there will see that we have, day in and day out, clear weather. It has been said by the Department which takes cognizance of such subjects that for ninety days in the fall of the year we have absolutely a cloudless sky in Colorado; and to-day, while Michigan, including its beet-sugar ground, is covered with snow, our State, aside from the high mountains, is bare of snow, and our farmers are plowing and gathering the beets, if they have not already done so.

The beet-sugar industry to-day promises more to the American people than any industry, unless it be the great iron and textile manufactures. The American people are using very nearly 90 pounds of sugar for every man, woman, and child, but the per capita consumption has to be increased 10 pounds before we reach the average per capita consumption of Great Britain. The sugar consumption of that country largely goes into marmalades and preserves, while in the United States it represents the sugar the American laborer uses on his table. There are no people in the world who actually use so much sugar per capita as we do. It has now become a well-known fact in scientific circles that sugar is not a luxury, but a necessity for health and strength and growth. The French Government has determined that rations of sugar are one of the best things they can give their army, and every French soldier who goes out to fight the battles of France or even to lie in camp in their fortresses has a ration of sugar.

Mr. President, I do not want to enlarge upon this, because it is time to quit. Much might be said about this being an infant industry. We have been sending abroad a hundred to a hundred and twenty-five million dollars a year, and sometimes even more, for foreign sugar. We have bought our sugar of people who practically bought nothing of us, and we will continue to do it. We have been buying the cheap sugar of Java, raised by men who get 10 cents a day. Our sugar growers get \$2 a day. We have been buying the cheap sugar of Ceylon. We have been buying it all over the world. We bought it from Cuba, where a man can live on less than he can in the United States. Here the men demand more than they do in Cuba.

I do not wish to say anything against the Cuban laborer, but he is not the American laborer. He does not live as the American laborer does. He does not demand what the American laborer demands. He lives in a hut. If you go down there you will find thousands of them living in huts that did not cost \$10 apiece. You will not find the American sugar grower living in a hut of that kind, and you do not want to see him living in a hut of that kind.

I agree with my colleague that the protection which is being given to sugar in this country is not too high for the present, but I do see the time when, in my opinion, a very great reduction can be made in the tariff, because when these great enterprises are once established, when we shall have learned exactly how to raise beets and how to make sugar, we will be able to do it for very much less, and the American consumer will get his sugar 25 or 30 or 40 per cent cheaper than he is getting it to-day.

Mr. President, I started in to say something about the amount of sugar in a beet. When the French under Napoleon began to

raise sugar, it was said that 4 per cent was just about the amount of sugar in a beet. They raised it to 6 per cent; they raised it to 8 per cent; they raised it to 10 and 12 per cent. The average in the United States is not to exceed probably 14 or 15 per cent. We have raised beets in Colorado that were nearly one-third sugar. We raised those beets because of the climatic conditions. We raised those beets because we could take off the water and ripen the beet when we wanted to. The difficulty which the Michigan man and the Wisconsin man and men from other sections encounter in trying to raise beets is that the heavens do not always facilitate the ripening of the beets. The rains come and the beets continue to grow.

I have seen beets growing in Arizona that grew all the year round and never stopped growing. The beet must stop growing. It must ripen; then the sugar comes into the beet. The sugar that gets into the beet is usually in the last month of its growth, and unless you can take off the water and ripen the beet you will not be certain of the amount of sugar you can raise. Thirty-two per cent of some beets has been found to be sugar. Of course that is not the usual amount. I met one of the active sugar growers of Colorado, a man who put his own money into the business, not only in one factory but in two or three, and he said to me, "Last year we ground tons and tons of beets that went 22 per cent sugar," and in Europe 10, 12, 13, or 14 per cent is considered fair.

I do not want to make any extended remarks on this subject at this hour, but I do desire to say, in reply to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH], who would seem to indicate that he thought we were asking something unusual, that we do not ask any favors. If it is the policy of the Government to put the tariff 20 per cent lower, put it there, and we will try to make our conditions correspond to it; but we do insist that an industry which promises to provide one of the articles of food and one of the necessities of life to a high civilization—and in twenty years it will require at least \$400,000,000 a year to supply the American people with sugar, if the consumption continues to grow as it has been growing for some years—is entitled to the same protection to which any other industry is entitled.

Mr. President, we were told two years ago that there was great suffering in Cuba and that, because of the distress in Cuba, we should ameliorate their condition by buying their sugar, which we could only do by putting down the tariff duty. We took all the sugar that Cuba made, and we took it at prices that gave to her a profit; and Cuba, instead of raising 650,000 tons, raised 850,000 tons, and this year will raise 1,250,000 tons. Do you suppose it raises it because it can not do anything else? The Cubans can raise tobacco; and they send into the markets of the world \$28,000,000 worth of tobacco, manufactured and unmanufactured, an export of tobacco alone that was practically a per capita export equal to our per capita export of all the exports from the United States. Cuba has the greatest net exports in the world; that is, the greatest net between the exports and the imports has been found in Cuba. Cuba can make sugar at a rate at which no American cane grower or beet-sugar grower can make it.

If you are in favor of free trade, and if every industry must take care of itself, that is one thing. I am not in favor of that. I believe it is righteous and just to consider the condition of every infant industry in this country, and if an industry is one of that class which, by the fostering care of the Government, can be made a great industry, beneficial to the American people, I am in favor of it, and I have always given my vote upon that principle, and I always shall. But will any man tell me to-day why you should select sugar? Why should you say to Cuba, "We will let your sugar in here at a reduction of one-fifth of the rate at which we let in other people's sugar?" Do you expect to give to the American sugar consumer any benefit by that reduction? On the contrary, you declare that the money shall go into the hands of the sugar producer in Cuba. I say here, as I said before, that this is the most wicked and ridiculous economic proposition that ever was submitted to the human race. I challenge you gentlemen on the other side to show anywhere in the history of the world where any nation has been so forgetful of the interests of her own people that she has given a bounty to build up an industry in a foreign land to compete with her own.

Mr. President, if this wickedness shall be completed and if this great outrage shall be perpetrated upon the American nation, because it is an outrage upon every man in it, in that it is a violation of the fundamental principles of a free government and a free people, there ought to be an end of any such thing as an attempt to foster industries by a tariff.

Mr. President, I shall not, even under such conditions as these, abandon my conviction of the wisdom of taking care of infant industries. I can not be driven from the convictions of many years by the improper conduct of my associates here or anywhere else. But I know it is absolutely indefensible, and I want some Senator on the other side of the Chamber to tell me how he reconciles it

with justice and right to select for such treatment one industry, and that, too, an infant one needing our assistance, and one which promises some day to be a great and magnificent blessing to the whole people of this country in providing one of the health-giving foods.

I want some one to tell me what excuse there is for it. We had the lying pretense here for more than two years that there were poverty and distress in Cuba. There is not a section of the United States anywhere in better industrial condition now than is the island of Cuba.

I have no doubt this crime will be completed by the passage of this bill. I have had an idea that I would try to amend it. I thought I would offer a provision that the sugar should at least be raised by the hands of freemen and not serfs. But I know the edict has gone forth that no amendment shall be made to the bill, and if I should spend my time here in attempting to do it, I should destroy an opportunity for somebody to discuss the bill upon its merits and not upon the technicality which would be raised if I should offer the amendment.

Mr. President, I am going to dismiss this case. I do not expect to utter another word on it during the debate. I am going to leave it with the declaration that in my judgment the sugar duty remitted will not go into the hands of the Cubans. There is not even that pretense to be made. It will go into the pockets of the great sugar trust. I have in my desk a statement which shows that for many years we have had a countervailing duty on sugar coming from Germany. I charge here and now, and if anybody denies it I will prove it from the record, that the great sugar trust has absorbed that countervailing duty, amounting to 28 cents a hundred, ever since it was put on, and has not given to Cuba the benefit of it, not even when Cuba was in the throes of revolution and distress. The trust will not do it now, when the Cuban planter and the laborer are in better condition than those of any agricultural section on the main continent.

Mr. President, influences that I can not understand, influences that I can not comprehend, have declared that this bill shall be enacted into law. I say to Senators, vote as your judgment dictates, for I have no right to do otherwise, but if the high and strong hand of Executive favor had not been used here, and if there were no fear of Executive disfavor, I do not believe this bill would ever have passed either body of Congress. It may be that that is beyond the rules of the Senate and of proper debate, but I can not help but believe that this bill represents not the judgment of the American people, but the judgment of somebody else.

I have had so much relation with this subject that I know that the great combination known as the sugar trust had control of the newspapers of this country to an extent no other enterprise ever did, and they filled the papers from one end of the land to the other with the lying statement that Cuba needed our generosity and our assistance. When that disappeared, when that lying pretense could no longer be made, then they overwhelmed us with the declaration that this was to our interest. Is it our interest to surrender on this main continent the production of an article of food for which in a few years we will pay, unless we raise it on our own land, from \$250,000,000 to \$400,000,000 a year? We have paid \$125,000,000 since this discussion began for sugar raised on other lands.

If there ever was in the history of legislation a case which justified the doctrine of protection, this is it. If there ever was an industry that needed the fostering care of the Government of the United States and promised, with slight and temporary assistance, to become a great profitable industry, it is the sugar industry.

Mr. President, I wish to say a word or two more. Not only have the newspapers of this country been filled with appeals to us, but the Government publications have been filled with appeals to us. I have now on my table a Government publication, published with the money wrung from the people of the whole nation and not of the few, in which there is an attempt to make it appear that the beet-sugar industry of this country does not need this protection, and that honor and justice demand that we should give to Cuba this remission of duties. Mr. President, nobody has shown us why. Nobody has pretended here that there is suffering in Cuba. Nobody here who has any regard for truth will pretend that there is any suffering there.

I say here that, in my judgment, the Cubans will practically get no benefit from the reduction, but it will go into the pockets of the great combination known as the "sugar trust," which has the capacity to secure legislation of this kind against an industry of a great portion of the West, where it is being built up.

I do not know whether the nine factories in Colorado will go into the scrap heap, as said Mr. Carey, from whom I read; I do not know but that they may live. I do not believe that many of those in other sections of the country will. I can not speak for Michigan; I have no right to speak for other States; but I do say

that if the result of this legislation goes into the pockets of the Cubans it will stimulate that industry there to the extent that it will eventually drive the sugar business out of the United States. Bad as it is, wicked as I think it is to put money into the hands of this great trust, I believe it is infinitely better for us that the sugar trust should steal it than that Cuba should get it when it does not need it.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, December 16, 1903, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, December 15, 1903.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday was read and approved.

PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6758, the pension appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. LAWRENCE in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6758, being the bill making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VAN VOORHIS] is recognized.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as the gentleman may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER].

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I have been gratified in some particulars at the course this debate has taken. I am glad that gentlemen on the other side of the aisle found it consistent with their sense of duty to give expression to their views upon the Panama question. I am glad indeed to know that the Democratic minority is in favor of the construction of the Panama Canal, notwithstanding they oppose all of the means and measures that have been suggested and adopted for its construction.

That kind of support, Mr. Chairman, is not very efficacious; it will not dig many canals; but it is in keeping with the attitude of that party upon all great measures that come up for consideration. In relation to the Cuban treaty, for instance, Members on the other side of the House declared repeatedly in the recent debate that they were in favor of the treaty and yet persistently undertook to load the bill making that treaty operative with amendments which, if adopted, they must have known would have resulted in its defeat.

During the Congress before substantially the same question was up for consideration, and the same amendment that gentlemen on the other side undertook to engraft upon the bill at this session was put upon the proposition in the last Congress, and the result was the absolute defeat of the treaty. That sort of support, Mr. Chairman, is not the kind that will inspire confidence in the wisdom and good faith of the Democratic party in relation to these great questions.

I have a fair appreciation, I believe, of the functions and responsibilities of the minority party in the administration of the affairs of this great Government. It has great opportunities and grave responsibilities, and it may contribute much toward wise legislation and pure administration. But there is always a danger that a minority party will degenerate into a party of capricious critics and caviling fault-finders and become a party of expediency, without character or conviction, ready to seize any opportunity that may appear to afford temporary advantage against its adversary; and I fear, Mr. Chairman, that the Democratic party of to-day has evolved into that deplorable condition.

I speak of the Democratic party as an organized entity. I have no reference to the individual members of that party, for as individuals and citizens they are wise, patriotic men; but the party as an organized entity has its own character and attributes, and as such it is responsible to the people of this country for the discharge of its duties.

The press reports in the last few days have announced that there is great liability of war upon the Isthmus of Panama; that the Republic of Colombia is preparing to make war against the United States and the Republic of Panama to reestablish its sovereignty over the Isthmus.